THE SOCIAL PROBLEM

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

PRESENTED BY
Gettysburg College Library

HN64
.S93

Gettysburgian

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 4 1970
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

SOCIAL PROBLEM,

BY

J. H. W. STUCKENBERG,

AUTHOR OF "THE LIFE OF IMMANUEL KANT;" "INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY;" "THE AGE AND THE CHURCH;" "TENDENCIES IN GERMAN THOUGHT;" ETC., ETC., ETC.

YORK, PA.:
SOCIAL PROBLEM PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1897.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1897, by
SOCIAL PROBLEM PUBLISHING COMPANY,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D. C.

PRESS OF P. ANSTADT & SONS.

PREFACE.

A few words on the origin of this volume will enable the reader the better to understand its contents. During a residence of fourteen years in Berlin, the centre of the most compact, most powerful, and most resolute socialistic movement, the author became absorbed in the Social Problem. Besides personal contact with social democrats and anarchists, with Christian and State socialists, he conducted the discussion on Socialism by the German university students connected with the Young Men's Christian Association in Berlin, and during nine winters, in the same city, lectured on the relation of the Church to Socialism. An especial study was made of the characteristic and dominant forces and tendencies of the age, without which the Problem, in which they culminate, cannot be interpreted. For years the author has studied the same subject in the United States, lecturing on it before laborers, popular audiences, and institutions of learning, and editing the *Social Problem Department* in the *Homiletic Review*. This study at home and abroad produced the conviction that the Problem itself must be mastered before solutions are attempted, and that it can be mastered only if the uprising and unrest of laborers in the different countries are examined. The growing solidarity of laborers is an international phenomenon, and as such it must be studied if the great social movement in Europe and America is to be understood.

The subjects discussed in the book are the burning social questions of the day. They excite intense feeling, and often are the occasion of bitterness and violence. On many of the problems there is no agreement among specialists; and outside of their limited circle the contest rages fiercely. Capital and labor are too much inclined to settle the controversy according to class prejudice and interest. Under these circumstances the impartial investigator cannot hope to please either party. Nothing is left for him but frankly to state his convictions, to strive to appreciate those of other inquirers, and to seek to promote an understanding by urging the antagonistic parties to study and work co-operatively for the solution of the Social Problem.

Instead of promoting the partisan spirit, the volume aims at the union of all men of worth and integrity, of religion and patriotism, on a higher basis than that of material interests. Economic affairs must, however, be thoroughly discussed. To the workers in brain

and brawn the earnings must be sacredly appropriated at all hazards. Whatever men may endure, they will not submit to injustice. But the workers can only get what they earn when those who earn nothing get nothing. The enemies of society are those who produce nothing, but are the appropriators and absorbers of what others have produced.

Careful readers will not misunderstand what is said about the limitation of individual wealth. It is not intended to apply to what men actually earn ; but it applies directly to such as concentrate vast wealth which they did not earn. If such concentration cannot be prevented, it ought to be limited. Economists are also beginning to question whether, if all is given to men they earn, the accumulations of rent, profit, and interest ought not to be limited. The subject is ripe for discussion, not for decision.

It is not as a matter of expediency, but as a result of experience with extremists and of long investigation, that the spirit of the volume is tentative rather than dogmatic, and constructive rather than destructive.

For the literature used the author is chiefly indebted to the Royal Library in Berlin, and to the Harvard and Boston Libraries. Care has been taken not to burden the pages with unnecessary references ; books have, however, been referred to when required by justice to authors. Such readers as desire to continue their investigation of the themes discussed will find references to numerous works at the close of the chapters. Some well-known books and others of interest to learned specialists are omitted. The works mentioned are selected because believed to be most serviceable for the comprehension of the subject. In the books referred to, the best literature on our Problem is quoted or mentioned, so that the investigator cannot be at a loss respecting the best means for the most profitable inquiry.

J. H. W. STUCKENBERG,

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., OCT 12, 1897.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION, - - - - - - - - 9

The Uprising, 9; Growth of Socialism, 11; The Student's Opportunity, 13; Problem and Solution, 15; Free Inquiry, 16; Difficulties, 17; Familiar, Yet Mysterious, 20; Unconscious Processes, 22; Interpretation of theseProcesses, 22; Principles, 22; The Method, 23; Plan of the Volume, 24.

CHAPTER II.

THE MEANING OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM, - - - 26

Social, 26; The Individual and Society, 27; The Social Organism, 30; The Concrete Individual, 32; Social Realism, 33; A Process, 34; The Labor Question, 35; Social Inequality, 37; Limit to Social Equality, 37; Problems Involved, 39; The Definition, 42; One or Many Social Problems, 43; The Classes Especially Involved, 43; Efforts at Realization, 44; Disciplines Involved, 46; Social Point of View, 48; The Crisis, 49; Where Found, 51; Diversity in Unity, 51; Labor and Laborers, 53; Proletariat, 54; Other Terms Applied to Laborers, 56; Literature, 57.

CHAPTER III.

THE CAUSES OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM, - - - 60

The Passion for Humanity, 60; What is to be Accounted for, 61; Origin of Problems, 61; Problems as the Ages, 63; History of Labor, 63; History and the Age, 64; Human Nature, 65; Twofold Change, 65; Modern Method of Production, 66; Change in Capital, 67; The Factory, 68; Change in Labor, 68; Intellectual Effect, 70; Capital Reproductive, 71; Division of Labor, 72; Co-operation of Labor, 73; Concentration of Laborers, 74; Displacement of Laborers, 75; Women and Children, 76; Other Changes, 77; Over-Production, 77; Æsthetic Effects, 78; Names, 80; Change in Laborers, 80; Education, 81; Means, 82; Politics, 83; Epochs, 83; Modern Ideas, 85; Promotion of these Ideas, 85; Demands of Society, 86; Other Forces,

87; Wealth, 88; Sport, 88; The Result, 88; The Ideal and the Real, 89; The Outlook, 91; Social Science, 91; Equalization, 92; Socialism, 93; Lassalle, 94; Karl Marx, 95; Labor in England, 95; Friedrich Engels, 96; Labor on the Continent, 97; Theories of Marx, 98; Effect on Laborers, 99; The Hope, 100; Compared with Former Movements, 100; Literature, 101.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM IN THE U. S., - - - - 103

American Optimism, 103; Pessimism, 104; The Presidential Campaign, 105; Foreign Specialists, 105; Peculiarities in the United States, 107; A Foreign Problem, 107; American Laborers, 110; Conditions a Century Ago, 111; Changes in Labor, 113; Other Changes, 116; Character of Wealth, 118; Legal Protection of Labor, 123; Change in Legislation, 125; Legislative Needs, 127; Diplomatic and Consular Service, 131; Condition of Laborers, 133; Working Women, 137; Slums, 139; Labor Organizations, 145; Our Danger, 149; Our Safety, 149; Literature, 153.

CHAPTER V.

THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM, - - - 155

The Solution, 155; Preparation, 157; Construction, 158; Existing Forces, 159; Traditionalism, 160; Despair, 162; Is Our Problem Solvable? 163; Laws of Progress, 165; Permanent Social Factors, 168; The Problem Left to Laborers, 170; Co-operation of Forces, 172; Christian Socialism, 174; Temporary Relief and Actual Remedy, 175; The Desirable and the Possible, 177; Delusions, 178; Hope, 180; Literature, 181.

CHAPTER VI.

SOLUTION BY REVOLUTION. COMMUNISM. THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY. ANARCHISM, - - - - 182

The Alternative, 182; Revolution, 185; The Aim of Revolution, 186; Individual Action, 187; The Corruption of Society, 188; Despair and Revolution, 188; Sign of the Times, 190; Characteristics of the Movements, 190; Socialism, 190; 1. Communism, 192; Limits to Communism, 193; Existing Communism, 194; Enforced Communism, 195; 2. The Social Democracy, 196; The Problem to be

Solved, 197; The Historic Law of Marx, 199; All Productive Capital Made Social, 201; Private Property Possible, 202; Religion, 203; Details, 204; Inauguration of the Socialistic State, 204; Immediate Demands, 205; Propaganda, 206; Criticism, 207; Development, 210; 3. Anarchism, 211; Its Principle, 212; Individualism Run Mad, 214; Men of Deed, 214; Revelation of the Age, 215; The Cause of Anarchism, 216; Origin of Anarchism, 218; Anarchistic Meetings, 220; Anarchistic Diversity, 223; Nihilism, 224; Literature, 225.

CHAPTER VII.

SOLUTION BY EVOLUTION. 1. EVOLUTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL. 2. EVOLUTION OF ORGANIZATIONS, - - 227

Revolution, When Justifiable, 227; Evolution and Revolution, 228; Evolution versus Revolution, 229; Thoroughness of the Evolution, 231; System, 232; 1. Evolution of the Individual, 235; Socialization of the Individual, 236; The Transition Era, 237; The University of Life, 239; Education of Laborers, 241; 2. Evolution of Organizations, 243; The Law of Organization, 244; Labor Organizations, 246; Reasons for Labor Organizations, 248; The Right of Labor Organizations, 250; Evolution of Labor Organizations, 251; Strikes, 255; Arbitration, 259; Organizations for Industrial Co-operation, 263; Organizations for Co-operative Study and Work, 269; Literature, 271.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOLUTION BY EVOLUTION—CONCLUDED. 3. EVOLUTION OF THE CHURCH. 4. INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION, - - 272

3. Evolution of the Church, 272; Christian Sociology, 273; The Rich and the Poor, 275; Societies of the Church, 278; 4. Industrial Evolution, 280; The Change Needed, 282; Social Claims, 284; Organic Relations, 285; Industrial Organizations, 286; Evolution in Political Economy, 287; A Human Science, 289; Dominance of Natural Law, 290; Self-Interest, 291; Growth of Capital, 292; The Personal Law, 293; Results, 294; Literature, 296.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FUNCTION OF THE STATE IN THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM, - - - - - - 299

The State, 299; Development of the Theory of the State, 301; The State and Society, 303; Fourfold Function of the State, 305; The Personality in these Functions, 306; Politics, 306; Responsibility of States and Communities, 307; Liberty, 308; Equality, 309; Equality of Opportunity, 310; Wrong View of Evolution, 311; Education, 312; Education and Politics, 316; The State and Industries, 317; Social Politics, 320; A Limited State Socialism, 320; Evolution of the State, 322; The Principle, 323; Regulation of Industries, 324; Protection of Laborers, 325; Æsthetics, 331; Dissension Among Laborers, 333; Conflicts and the State, 334; The State and Municipality as Capitalists, 335; Private Property, 338; Literature, 340.

CHAPTER X.

THE FUNCTION OF THE STATE IN THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.—CONCLUDED. - - - 343

The Land Problem, 343; History of Property in Land, 344; Nationalization of Land, 346; Taxation, 350; Mines, 353; Limitation of Individual Wealth, 353; Concentration of Wealth and Crises, 358; Great Enterprises, 359; Ability and Ambition, 359; How Limit, 362; Inheritance, 364; Tentative, 366; Benefit to Laborers, 367; Result, 368; Literature, 372.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

The Uprising.

The emergence of the submerged classes and the agitation of the masses are portentous signs of the times. Laborers are forming a solidarity, both national and international; and where long ignored or subjected, the common people, as distinct from the aristocracy of birth and intellect and wealth, now come to the front with demands deemed extravagant by the ruling classes, and with threats of revolution. These are not isolated phenomena, but characteristics of the age, extending from Scandinavia to Sicily, and from Russia and Finland to California and even Australia. If we concentrate these movements into what is known as the Social Problem, we readily see how this problem involves the burning questions of the day.

Ours is the era of the Social Problem. This more than any other theme has become the centre of thought and feeling, the cause of popular excitement and practical effort, the occasion of bright hopes and darkest forebodings. The student of the times will not hesitate to confirm the statements of Mr. Frederick Harrison:* "There is upon us, both in England and America, a social ferment that goes deeper than any mere constitutional struggle. It is the vague, profound, multiform, and mysterious upheaval that is loosely called Socialism,—not Socialism in any definite formula, but the universal yearning of the millions

* In the beginning of his "Studies in Early Victorian Literature."

for power, consideration, material improvement, and social equality. . . . All orders and classes are concerned in it: all minds of whatever type are affected by it: every political, social, or industrial axiom has to be considered in the light of it: it appeals to all men and it enters into life at every corner and pore. We are like men under the glamor of some great change impending. The spell of a new order holds us undecided and expectant. There is something in the air, and that something is a vague and indescribable sense that a new time is coming." Another English writer declares that "all the sciences are now resolving themselves into one—the Social Science. All the problems are resolving themselves even faster into one—the Social Problem." Monarchs and statesmen, the profoundest philosophers, and the first thinkers in political economy, have been absorbed by the problem and baffled in the effort of its solution. In a message issued in 1883, Emperor William I. said: "Our imperial duties require that we neglect no means within our power to improve the condition of the laborers and to promote the peace of the different classes, so long as God grants us the opportunity to act." Numerous official documents similar to this in spirit have been issued in Europe. Not choice, but necessity led the haughty aristocracy and the contented, privileged classes to consider the condition and rights of laborers. For decades philosophy was concerned chiefly about questions of knowledge: its nature, its method, its limits, and its relation to the world of reality; but the philosopher Wundt of Leipzig declares that philosophy has now been diverted from such questions to the consideration of ethical subjects, which involve our social relations.

Professor Rein of Jena says that in the seventeenth century religious questions united and divided the people; in the eighteenth, philosophy absorbed the attention; the

natural sciences were dominant in intellectual pursuits till the middle of the nineteenth; but now social science reigns.*

Growth of Socialism.

It is thus evident that thought is attracted and directed by the practical tendencies of the age, particularly by those of a social character. As typical of these tendencies we regard the growth of the social democracy in Germany, the land in which the Social Problem has received most attention. The progress of this revolutionary party is seen in the votes cast in the German empire for members of Parliament, from 1867 to 1893:

1867, - - - -	40,000
1877, - - - -	493,288
1887, - - - -	763,128
1890, - - - -	1,427,298
1893, - - - -	1,786,758

This growth is phenomenal. In the number of popular votes cast in Germany the social democracy is far in advance of all the other parties. It has 48 members in Parliament, 41 daily and 123 other journals.† In Berlin, the seat of government and the home of numerous officials, the German Athens in point of culture, and the city in

* "Deutsche Rundschau," March, 1897.

† The Paris journal, "Peuple," gives the following statistics of Socialism in the beginning of 1897. France had socialistic votes, 1889: 91,000; 1893: 600,000; 1896: 1,400,000. They elected 62 representatives, had majorities in 29 large cities, Paris included, and in 1,200 small ones, and have 78 journals. Italy had 20,000 socialistic votes in 1893, and 90,000 in 1896. The representatives number 19, the journals 33. In Denmark there are 713 socialistic associations, 9 representatives, 6 daily and 3 other papers; the votes were, 1872: 315; 1884: 6,805; 1887: 8,408; 1890: 17,232; 1893: 25,019. Belgium has 5 daily and many weekly socialistic journals, and 29 representatives. Votes, 1894: 344,000; 1896: 461,000. Votes in Switzerland, 1896: 107,000; Austria, 1895: 90,000, and 65 daily and weekly journals. England, votes, 1895: 98,000. United States, 1881: 2,068; 1890: 13,331; 1892: 21,157; 1894: 33,133, 1896: about 40,000.

which wealth is greatly concentrated and very powerful, this party in 1890 cast 126,522 votes in the parliamentary election, over twenty thousand more than the total of all the other parties. This number was increased in 1893; and at present five of the six members of Parliament from that city belong to this party

Similar movements have taken place in other countries. It is as true now as when Laveleye wrote it, that "the red spectre haunts our imaginations and we fancy ourselves on the eve of a social cataclysm. What is certain is, that socialism has recently spread, under various forms, to an extraordinary degree. In its violent form, it is taking possession of the minds of almost all mining and manufacturing operatives, and at this very moment it is beginning to invade the rural districts. The agrarian movement which lately agitated Ireland, which has just been suppressed in Andalusia, and which is brewing in other places, is plainly inspired by socialistic ideas. In scientific garb, socialism is transforming political economy and is occupying the greater number of professional chairs in Germany and Italy. Under the form of state socialism, it sits in the council-chamber of sovereigns; and finally, under a Christian form, it is making its influence felt in the hearts of the Catholic clergy, and still more in the hearts of the ministers of the different Protestant denominations." * Violent outbreaks have occurred in the Latin, the Teutonic, and the Slavic lands, and they seem to be simply the first rumblings of the approaching earthquake. In this era of fermentation a social leaven is constantly transforming society peacefully, while revolutionary schemes threaten and alarm the nations. In many places radical measures are most acceptable to the masses. With its definite pro-

* "Socialism of To-Day," Introduction.

gramme, its proposed changes, and its bright promises to laborers, the social democracy is winning to its standard multitudes of workingmen throughout Europe and America.* Many other facts are given in the following pages which indicate the rapid growth of interest in our problem and show the demand for its profound study.

The Student's Opportunity.

The emergencies in our immediate environment and the dominant trend of the age force the Social Problem on our attention. It will evidently be the question of coming generations, as it is the absorbing theme of our day. The interests at stake and the urgency of the demands make the problem the sphere of greatest opportunity. Rich harvests are waiting to be reaped by the thinker and worker in social subjects. Not only does the student of society behold before him the fruits of past sowing and growth, but new fields remain to be cultivated. Besides the inheritance from past ages, the history of the nineteenth century is marked by important social achievements since St. Simon, Robert Owen, Ferdinand Lassalle, and Karl Marx began their agitations; some questions have been settled, others of greater magnitude have become prominent, the atmosphere has been cleared, new points of view have been gained. But the achievement in social discussion and movement is slight compared with what

---

* At the meeting of the British Trades Union Congress in Edinburgh, Sep. 9, 1896, the following resolution was passed, after an excited debate, by a vote of 172 to 47:

"THAT, in the opinion of this Congress, it is essential to the maintenance of British industries to nationalize the land, mines, minerals, royalty, rents, and railways, and municipalize all water, artificial light, and tramways' undertakings within their several authorities, and that the Parliamentary Committee be instructed to promote and support legislation with the above object."

This resolution was less sweeping than the one adopted in 1894, for which it was substituted; but it clearly shows the drift toward the socialization of industries which are now private.

remains to be done. Whoever fathoms the meaning of our age knows that this is no time for quietly enjoying the fruit of the past; whatever we reap from former ages has significance chiefly because it helps us as sowers and cultivators. In these times of leavening processes and of fermentations no thoughtful man can so lose himself in what is as to forget what ought to be. Understand a seed and you will know what plant must spring from it; so there are seeds of the present in which we behold the developments of the future. It requires no extraordinary prophetic insight to see that our age is an era when history is made, when new principles are struggling toward supremacy, and when radical transformations are imminent. The earnest student soon discovers that in an era of changes danger lies close to the opportunities. So momentous are the interests involved in the chief concerns of social thought that every considerate mind approaches them with caution. Mistakes now mean so much, and for that reason no pains should be spared at the outset to avoid them. Their very eagerness may be a snare to intense students. For the social inquirer the saying of Pestel, the Russian poet and would-be reformer, is weighty. On the way to execution he said: "I wished to reap the harvest before sowing the seed." These words contain the simple story of many a life, the history of numerous failures, and a lesson of especial significance for our excited haste and fatal impatience. When we consider the evils to be eradicated, the blessings to be conferred, and the usual slowness of historic processes, we can appreciate the application of Bismark's words to our sanguine prophets and revolutionary reformers who would transform society in a day: "Do leave some problem for our children to solve; it might otherwise be tedious for them in a world in which they find nothing to do."

Problem and Solution.

As the sowing, so the reaping; attend to the causes, and the effects will take care of themselves. At the meeting of a philosophical society the president stated that it is common for people to expect effects without the producing cause. The statement seems incredible; yet one need but reflect on the neglect of causes in the formation of character, in expecting to reap good where evil is sown, and on the fact that so much in life is attributed to accident and chance, in order to learn how often effects are expected regardless of the causes. Our day furnishes an instructive illustration. Socialism is prominently before the public, it is investigated both historically and philosophically, and its literature is extensive; but the Social Problem, on which socialism depends for its origin and significance, is either ignored, or has not received the same profound thought and diligent inquiry. There are many, otherwise intelligent men, who identify the Social Problem and socialism; that is, they identify cause and effect, the problem and its proposed solution. The reason for this strange perversion throws light on the problem itself. Laborers were long agitated by the Social Problem, while the other members of society treated it as not concerning them, and therefore ignored it. Leaders of laborers soon passed to socialism, adopting it as the cure for their ills. For them the problem ceased to be a problem; socialism was heralded as its solution, and henceforth this solution was presented to laborers and the world for acceptance. So aggressive and so violent were the demands of socialists for a total subversion of the present social system, that the favored classes of society, who had ignored the existing Social Problem, could not ignore the threatened destruction. Hence the system of revolutionary socialism arrested the attention of statesmen and capitalists and the middle and professional classes, while

the problem it was proposed to solve was not understood, or, at least, was not so prominently before their minds. Socialism was the medium through which they discovered the Social Problem, and sometimes they saw the medium without penetrating into the problem itself. Surely every careful thinker will aim to master the problem first, and then seek its solution. He will not be guilty of considering an effect while ignoring its cause.

Free Inquiry.

Another perversion should be met at the very start. As laborers were led from the Social Problem to socialism, so now many take it for granted that a specialist in that problem is a revolutionary socialist. They ignore the fact that economists, statesmen, philosophers, theologians, and other scholars study the subject for the purpose of finding a yet unknown solution, and that socialism itself is tested by them according to its merits. These are the very men to whom we must look for the exposure of the errors and dangers in false solutions. It is hardly a less significant sign of the times that such a specialist is apt to be regarded as an enemy of capitalists, just as if the study of the subject implied that revelations which compromise capital are inevitable! Some employers are so morbidly sensitive that they feel hurt whenever the grievances of laborers are mentioned. Is not this singularly like the confession of a consciousness of guilt? This sensitiveness of capital would be explicable were capital, like a saloon, in itself disreputable; but may not some capitalists be saints, while others are sinners? There are capitalists and capitalists, employers and employers, and we must discriminate between the base and the noble, the brutal and the humane. Whether through ignorance or guilt, men can still be found who deprecate the discussion of the Social Problem; must we not then conclude that there are some things which, in

their estimation, cannot bear the light of day? Those who do not want the solution of the problem inquired into make the impression that they fear the problem might be solved to their own detriment or that the hopelessness of the situation may be revealed. It is madness to attempt to check honest inquiry while society is threatened by anarchism and nihilism. Fortunately, it is impossible to stop investigation or to prevent the publication of its results. Those who try to interfere with this will be crushed under the wheels of progress. Every man, of every class, with a pure heart and clean hands, is interested in having the investigation as complete, and the exposure of evils as full, as possible. The class prejudice which now prevails makes it almost impossible for one to speak frankly of the situation without creating suspicion that he sides with one party and opposes another; but the study of the subject will develop impartial investigators who rise above this prejudice, who discern good and bad men in all classes, and who do not hesitate to judge with discrimination and fairness, however much they may incense the biased partisan spirit of bitter factions. No honest student will care to win the favor of men who feel it as a personal thrust whenever iniquity is exposed and condemned, or who think their portrait is painted when the devil is portrayed.

Difficulties.

These perversions aside, the impartial investigator finds his path beset with difficulties. Thorough research solely in the interest of truth and justice is far more difficult than to choose a side arbitrarily and thus end further inquiry. Strong as the class prejudices are, they are by no means the only difficulties with which the social student is obliged to contend. The problem itself is involved in perplexing intricacies. The upright men in every community are anxious to give

the laborer his full desert; they admit that a failure to do so is robbery. If from such men he does not get his dues it must be owing to their inability to determine his share of the wealth and how to secure it for him. No one questions that every man ought to get all he earns, reaping as he sows. But when a multitude plow, sow, cultivate and harvest, each doing his part of the work and co-operating with the rest, how can the exact share of each be determined? They differ in intellect and skill, in diligence and efficiency; and where so many peculiar factors enter into the production of the result it is manifestly impossible to give each one its particular product, no more, no less. As one of the multitude, I reap in my share of the harvest something others have sown, and I had a part in producing what they reap. If, now, in the very nature of the case, each one cannot get just the result of his own work, what method shall be adopted for the division of the product? This question touches the heart of many of the most harassing perplexities of the day. The situation is extremely embarrassing. There are possessions of fraud, but also such as are the reward of honest toil, of intellectual achievement, of sacrifice, and of saving. What part of the harvest belongs to righteous capital? How large a share ought to go to intellect, to skill, and to the host of manual laborers?

Political economy has no satisfactory answer. The various factors which enter production are incomparable quantities; we seek in vain for the exact equation between intellect, skill, toil, and money, and do not see how justice in the distribution of the product can be determined mathematically. Hence we resort to various expedients: we adopt, in our industries, an actual or supposed natural law and give to it the supremacy, instead of ethics; we do not choose our course rationally, but move along the grooves worn out by historic processes and stick in the ruts of tra-

ditionalism; we ignore the claims of the personality and become the slaves of artificial methods; we estimate labor according to its supply and demand, not according to its needs, its actual service, and its sacrifices; as consumers, we buy without scruple in the cheapest markets, and are righteously indignant at the employer for doing the same thing in buying the exertion of the laborer at the lowest rate! Were consistency our jewel and life not too mechanical for serious reflection, we might recognize such conduct as an insult to conscience, as unworthy of our professed religion and humanity, and as a degradation of our industries, as it is a disgrace to our civilization. The principles adopted leave no doubt why the beautiful garden of our industries is turned into a bloody battle-field. The reflective cannot but query whether we are not on the wrong track and must go further wrong the longer we continue our course. If absolute justice, in the sense that to each shall go what he produces and no more, is impossible, cannot at least so much of the product be given to every faithful worker as will enable him and his family to live in a manner worthy of human beings? We cannot always say just how much men ought to have, or ought not to have; but it must surely be possible to fix the least which an honest toiler deserves, what he must have to live properly, the minimum that he will and ought to fight for to the utmost.

Much will be gained if in the fatal conflicts of the day the industrial warfare is recognized as not wholly due to antagonistic interests, to selfishness, to avarice, and to the envy or insolence of the contending parties. Frequently these are potent causes; but others also prevail. We are caught in social meshes, and with the best intentions are unable to disentangle ourselves. Candid men realize this; their saddest experience springs from the conviction that

they are not able to furnish the needed relief. They behold the tragedy of human toil, but it looks like the reign of Fate, such as the Greeks thought subjected even the gods. No censure adequate to the horrors can be heaped on the prevalent industrial abominations; but all the ills are not due to voluntary action and cannot be classified as the result of brutality. Earnest times make men earnest; and earnest men know that neither censure, nor whining sentimentality respecting human misery, can afford the needed relief. Pity and blame have their mission in arousing us to inquiry and action; but as study leads us to the depths of the Social Problem we become so profoundly impressed with the difficulties of the situation that censure and pity seem like mere incidents, while the way out of the entanglement becomes the absorbing theme.

Familiar, Yet Mysterious.

The profound inquiry which reveals the nature of the problem also reveals its difficulties. The Social Problem has the familiarity of daily occurrences. Thrusting itself constantly on our attention, it is peculiarly *our* problem, the problem of our environment and our age. So evident is the problem that it has all the mystery of the most familiar objects. The familiarity promotes insensibility and bars the way to the investigation of what seems self-evident. We treat such objects as if a knowledge of them were a matter-of-course, mere contact with them being deemed sufficient to reveal all they contain; hence we do not think it worth while to make a serious attempt to fathom their meaning. Yet the thinker is known by the discovery of problems where the ordinary mind sees none, and by fathoming the meaning of the mystery in familiar things.

Unconscious Processes.

The student must not think it strange if for a long time the growth of knowledge respecting the Social Problem is also a growth in the consciousness of its mysteries. That same study which reveals the mysteries will also lead to the solution. Specialists have by no means already passed through the darkness into the light; they dispute among themselves on many points, and therefore we ought not to be surprised at the confusion which prevails in the public mind. The social tendency, like all vast and complex movements, contains numerous elements of which even the leaders are apt to be unconscious. Sometimes they imagine themselves the movers when they are in reality moved by their followers or by circumstances. How often movements pass beyond the control of the leaders! Recent developments in thought have shown that frequently individuals, organizations, nations and ages are impelled by unconscious forces, whose irresistible power is especially manifested in crises or when great feeling is excited and momentous interests are at stake. At such times we pronounce dominant influences contagious or in the air; on some occasions they act with a kind of demoniac power, putting men beside themselves. Ages have their epidemics; we speak of the spirit or genius of an age, just as if the age itself were dominated, *nolens volens*, by its *Zeitgeist*. In a period like ours these unconscious forces are peculiarly active. Events occur which at first seem unaccountable, then they become common, and at last they are treated as every day affairs. They appear to come of themselves and we cannot locate the responsibility for them. We are not aware of their causes, can neither interpret nor control the forces at work in them, nor can we foretell the goal whither they tend. Things appear to drift instead of being the result of purpose. Efforts to check such courses are often like oil instead of water poured on fire.

Interpretation of these Processes.

These secret, unconscious processes we aim to discover and interpret; we want to become fully conscious of the dark, impulsive forces in ourselves and in the age. We must understand them in order to know why we are carried forward, and to determine the direction in which they shall carry us. So far as possible we want to get the conscious control of these forces. This can be done only by a thorough study of the age itself, by a research which reveals the historic factors that have produced the age, and by an analysis of the energies concentrated in the Social Problem. This is an investigation of causes. No mind can step out of itself into the objects beyond its consciousness; but every mind can correct and enlarge its conceptions by an effort to get the intellectual mastery of things. Our problem leads us into the most momentous realism of the age. Not canting phraseology on the Social Problem, often unmeaning and confusing, is our aim; but the social actuality, that mighty energy working, as with superhuman force, in society, and more eloquent than words can express. Beyond what the social movement reveals on the surface we inquire into its deeper meaning, what it implies and involves and portends.

Principles.

The preceding pages make clear the spirit with which we enter upon the task before us. On a subject so vast and so difficult we must expect honest differences among inquirers. But whatever differences prevail respecting details, we can, as a rule, hope to agree respecting certain general principles; and consensus on these gives a place on which to stand and from which to move unitedly into the future. In times of confusion and frenzied agitation valuable service may be rendered by a clear statement of the problems involved. Even with these sharply outlined, investigators may be able to

agree only respecting great principles; but agreement in these is the condition for harmonious work toward future progress. Whatever may be doubtful, it is usually possible to form some idea of what ought to be. This ideal gives a definite aim to research and conduct. Just how to accomplish what is desired may require much more investigation. If, for instance, there is a social increment which goes to such as have not earned it, then the problem of giving it to the persons or community to which it belongs becomes the definite object of solution. We may not know just how to socialize what pertains to society; but it will be an advantage to make such socialization the specific aim of inquiry. If a known minimum wage is necessary for the humane condition of the laborer, then it ought to be secured, whether by increasing his efficiency, or by making him an industrial partner, or by co-operation, or by changes in the present social system. However far we may be prepared to go in practical measures of reconstruction or revolution, it is essential that there be agreement respecting the fundamentals; and the promotion of this end is one of the chief aims of this volume.

The Method.

The purpose determines the method. Our preconceived notions, our traditional views and class prejudices, are no law for the interpretation of the Social Problem. In order to get at things as they are we may have to abandon our previous conceptions and become learners where we deemed ourselves fit to be teachers. Compared with a few decades since, we live in a new world, with new problems, new aspirations, new demands. Many of the old notions and methods are effete. It is this new world we must study. If we want to get the grip of the Social Problem we must interpret the agitations of the day, their origin, what the agitators aim at, and why society at large is disturbed, even if the agitators are con-

fined to a particular class. All that helps us to interpret the dominant social ideas and movements is valuable. In order to master the realism of the times the immediate environment must be investigated, the actual social condition must be examined personally. The study of the trend in labor circles is of especial importance, in order that the great movements of the age which rise from the bottom upward may be understood. An extensive and valuable literature on social themes is at the command of the student. Details are already overwhelming and yet constantly increasing. They can be mastered and made most useful by getting what is common to them, the laws which connect them, the system which they form. By thinking through the details we get their essence, what is substantial and characteristic. What is principiant and essential is of far more concern to the student than what is superficial, striking and sensational, but not causative or abiding, in a movement. The best results may be expected by the union of personal investigation with the use of the inquiries of other laborers in the social field. For the characteristics and movements of masses we are obliged to resort to statistics. Much literature of especial value for the study of our subject will be given in the following pages.

Plan of the Volume.

It is evident that before we attempt to do anything with it we must have a clear conception of the Social Problem. The confusion and contradictions in the discussion of the subject are in a large degree due to the fact that its exact meaning is not clearly apprehended. Many efforts at solution are the veriest quackery, because they fail to fathom the depth and to measure the extent of the problem to be solved.

The book is divided into two general subjects: *The Interpretation of the Social Problem* and its *Solution.* In

order to bring the problem clearly before us we shall first consider its meaning and its causes. By far the larger part of the discussion is, however, devoted to the consideration of the solution of the problem. Our age, analytical, critical, negative, insists on the discovery and exposition of the prevalent evils, but is not equally strong in positive and constructive energies. This volume places the emphasis on the solution of the problem because there is especial need of this emphasis. Critical processes are required as a preparation for the solution; but mere criticism is no more the solution itself than tearing down an old house is the construction of a new building.

Our problem is international and must be treated as such; the social movement in a particular country is but a part of the greater international movement. The problem in the United States is, however, of especial interest, and is discussed in a separate chapter.

CHAPTER II.

THE MEANING OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

Social.

A problem is *social* which concerns or agitates society. Thus there are numerous social problems which pertain to the rights and duties of men in their associated capacity. When, however, we speak of *the* Social Problem, we mean that some question of society has assumed importance above the rest and is absorbing public attention. The very emphasis placed on it implies that it is a dominant problem, that there is special urgency for its consideration and solution, and that it is the burning question of society and the age.

This gives our inquiry a definite sphere. Humanity is the object of our study; not man, however, as isolated or a mere individual, but as a member of society. We are to consider what is now regarded as the supreme social concern.

The term *social* is itself vague, having a narrower and a broader signification. It is not sufficiently defined by distinguishing it from what pertains solely to the individual. So soon as men associate with any number of others we term them social. Perhaps they form a class, a party, or a faction, and these are called associations or societies. Yet they are but fragments of society in the largest sense. Ought not the man who has feeling for his clan only to be called clannish rather than social? Perhaps a faction but concentrates and intensifies individual selfishness; the spirit cultivated by a party is apt to be far less social than parti-

san. We shall avoid serious error by distinguishing between the interest of a class and the interest of society itself. A class interest can become destructive of society; men may organize for purposes called social which are really anti-social: they may be intent on the overthrow of society in order to promote their selfish ends. A robber-chief friendly to the society of his followers is none the less an enemy of society. Keeping in mind that what is social in one sense may be anti-social in another, we shall not be misunderstood when we affirm that in its deepest meaning a problem is social only if it concerns society itself or as a totality. A Pharisee who associates only with Pharisees, and cares solely for what concerns them, is social in an extremely limited sense: he is only pharisaically social.

The Individual and Society.

The relation of the individual to society must be understood if his share in the Social Problem is to be appreciated. The past has made us the heirs of numerous abstractions which are perpetuated by means of thoughtless traditionalism. Our problem has been confused by treating an abstract notion of society as a concrete reality; the name or idea of society has been clung to, while what actually constituted society was not apprehended. Men associate together, they form an association; and then the association is spoken of as if it were something in itself, independent of the men who constitute it. So society is frequently treated as an independent existence, an entity, a real being, something that can be moved by itself, regenerated or degenerated as a totality, and affected as a unit, like a tree or an animal. We say that society moves or is moved, but forget that this simply means that the individuals who compose society move and that there is nothing else to move. Perhaps some individuals move one way, others another, and hence the antagonism and chaos.

Society consists of individuals in their associated relations, and of nothing but associated individuals; and whoever speaks of society as distinct from the individuals who compose it may as well discuss a library without books, an association without anything that is associated. Human society consists of individual human beings as much as a forest consists of the separate trees, or a flock of sheep of the particular sheep which compose it. A family, an organization, the church, the state, all are a concrete reality only so far as they are composed of individuals; take these away, and what is there left of the family, of the organization, of the church, and the state?

Clear as this is, we find the error of taking society as an abstraction for reality so deeply rooted in the opinions of the day that we almost despair of its removal. Some are actually afraid of losing something valuable by substituting substantial reality for an empty abstraction, just as if there could be even a shadow left when the substance which casts it is gone. Especially is the fear great that loss will be suffered if the church cannot somehow continue to be a substantial something after all the persons composing it are taken away. To such we can only say that they ought to think through the meaning of the church, and to tell the world what a church without any members is.

Among the hardly credible things which happen is the claim that society can be changed as a whole without changing its individuals. It is actually heralded as a great mistake to work for the salvation of individuals; men ought to be saved in a mass, it is said. The reformation of persons one by one is declared to be too slow; but if society as a totality were reformed, it is held, the world's redemption would be nigh. Yet we have never discovered how a flock of an hundred sheep could be washed without washing each sheep. The following argument has, how-

ever, been presented as showing that society is to be redeemed *en masse*, and not by individuals. The fishes in a pond are sick because the water is foul. The owner takes them out one by one and puts them in a fresh pond. But a man comes along and shows him how to avoid this tedious process of saving one by one, namely, by removing the foul water and putting fresh water in its place. Thus, it is said, all the fish are saved, but not by individuals! How were the fish diseased? By the foul water. Were they diseased as a society or individually? It is likely that each fish was taken sick, some more than others, and that for this reason the whole society was sick. Perhaps some had so much power of resistance as not to be sick at all. How did the change of water affect the fish? By restoring each fish and thus making the whole society healthy. One or two may have been too far gone, so that they died, and the whole society of fish was not saved. The process of restoration was likely gradual, so that at one time the society began to be restored, then it was nearly restored, and then quite, because the individual fishes were in different stages of health until each was quite well.

By improving the soil a forest may be improved; but it can be done only by improving the various trees. So the condition of a family can be improved by means of a better home and more healthful food; yet every member of the family will derive the benefits and share in the improvement. In every society we find individuals the concrete factors; and it is by affecting the individual members that society itself is affected. As you cannot wash the flock without washing each sheep, so society cannot otherwise be reformed than by reforming the individuals which constitute it a society.*

* It is self-evident that there may be institutions and laws which affect all the members of society; and those who speak of reforming

The Social Organism.

The view that society has an independent existence of its own, that it is an entity and has concrete reality, so that it can be moved or affected as a person or a tree, is promoted by the fact that it is commonly called an organism. Individuals are then regarded as the members or organs of society. Sometimes the unity of the social organism is emphasized, while the individual members are made subordinate, at others the individuals receive the emphasis, and the organism is depreciated; now the members are treated as if they existed solely for the body they constitute, then the organism itself vanishes, leaving only the disintegrated or atomic elements of society. The riddle is solved so soon as the exact use of the word *organism* is determined. When applied to society it is employed figuratively, merely as an analogy. In its literal sense organism applies to an individual, as a concrete plant or an animal. If we apply it literally to society we lose essential elements of the personality; the man himself is then absorbed by society. Some writers who have attempted to explain social phenomena in terms of biology are in danger of confusing the subject which they seek to interpret. It is only figuratively that a man is a social cell; and we must pervert both man and society before we can literally make individuals the cells of the social organism. So men are not social organs in the sense in which the eye or arm is the organ of the body. A man is himself a far more perfect organism than the society he helps to form ever can be; he has real organs and uses them with a degree of perfection of which society

---

or saving society as a totality usually mean these. Such means of benefiting society are of the utmost importance, as we shall see later; but if laws and institutions and other agencies of a general character are represented as affecting society as an abstraction rather than as composed of individuals who are influenced, a false impression is made.

is not capable. In the literal sense an organism is always an individual with its life and source of action in itself; but society consists of individuals, and these constitute its life and activity. Our usual mistake consists in using such individual objects as a tree or a body to explain society, which is not an individual. The cells which form the physical organism are so vitally, organically united as to form a totality; the cells exist in and for the organism. But a man has worth in himself, can exist by himself, and can himself, in part at least, determine in what sense he is to be an organ of society. Crusoe lived without Friday, and might have continued to do so, had Friday not been found.

By analogy we can speak of a man as a social organ; but the term organ does not express exactly his relation to society, and he is also something else than an organ. Society is an organism in the sense that certain bonds, visible and invisible, unite men. These bonds need not be physical, as in the natural organism; they may be intellectual, ethical, political, and religious. Men in their social relations are not mere atoms; they are really associated, united by common interests, sympathies, aims, and works, by relationship or historic association, by legal and national bonds. The bonds are not less real because inner. Ties unite men, even if the men do not recognize them. But there are likewise voluntary organizations. Thus whatever associates men, whatever makes them act and react on one another, whatever gives them oneness of thought and purpose, that also serves so to unite them as to constitute society in a measure analogous to an organism. In this organism men do not lose their identity, their independence, and their personality; they do not coalesce as hydrogen and oxygen in forming water; nor do they mingle as drops that form a stream; neither are they as

distinct as the separate trees which make a forest. Society as an organism is *sui generis*.

We have here an important law for the application of figurative language. Whenever a figure is taken from a lower realm to illustrate something in a higher department of thought, the lower object is always inadequate. It usually has something which the higher has not, and the higher has something which the lower cannot have. The plus which it has makes it higher.

The Concrete Individual.

As thus explained we shall not hesitate to speak of society as an organism. Its concrete reality we have found in individual men as associated and united. But no more do we want to treat the individual as an abstraction than we do society. Men are not isolated, they are not mere ideas or abstract personalities; they must be taken as they actually are, with their relations and environment, what they are with these and made by them. Society is composed of individuals according to what they are and have and represent, with their souls, their bodies, and their possessions. The king as a social factor is not a mere personality equal to any other; he must be considered with his royal dignity, his prerogative and dominion. If we regard the personality only, without its attachments, we cannot possibly understand the difference between the pauper and the millionaire, as social factors. We lose that richness and fullness beheld everywhere in society if we take abstract personalities as its elements, instead of that infinite variety formed by actual men with their actual possessions. As a nation cannot be correctly apprehended otherwise than in and with the territory occupied and the relations the nation sustains, so society can be understood only when its members are considered in all the completeness of their being and possession and relation.

Social Realism.

Society, composed of individuals with numberless relations, is a compound so complex that its infinite multiplicity is usually apprehended in the vaguest manner. Owing to this difficulty of apprehension we try to satisfy our minds with some idea or notion which, however empty, is put for the reality. We discuss society, and yet miss that social realism which is essential for all valuable discussion. Even unconsciously we use society in a variety of meanings. In our present investigation we take society in a larger sense than the *elite* or an exclusive, fashionable, aristocratic circle. The Social Problem involves society as not exclusive but inclusive, in its widest sense embracing the inhabitants of a nation or all members of the human family. There are of course various degrees of intimacy, beginning with the family and extending to all kinds of voluntary associations, to business connections, to village communities, to municipalities, states and nations, and finally comprehending the whole of humanity. We are affected by nature, though we may not understand our relation to it or be able to explain its operations. Nature presents to us this problem: How can we discover, and thus make conscious to our minds, those laws to which we are now unconsciously subject? To master nature simply means to become conscious of its forces and to use them. The same holds respecting society: we want to master it by becoming conscious of its realism, of which at present we are largely unconscious. When we speak of society we take our own conception of it and cannot do otherwise; but is that conception true and sufficiently comprehensive? The elements which constitute the social organism do not, as we have seen, depend for their reality on our recognition; men may be constituent parts without being aware of the fact. Boston "society" may be taken for the select few whom fortune favors; but

a deeper sense includes in Boston society every inhabitant of Boston. According to this larger meaning we speak of the cream and the dregs of society, and designate various social classes as educated or illiterate, as rich, in moderate circumstances, or poor. We therefore belong necessarily to a society whose members we cannot all know and some of whom we may be ashamed to recognize. You may pronounce this enlarged view the *idea* of society; at the same time it must be admitted that it is also the actual and realistic society.

From the above it is evident that the Social Problem, if rightly named, concerns society itself, not a mere class or faction. Not less clear is it that the Social Problem is the concern of the individuals who compose society; it is not a question which can be relegated to society as an abstraction.

A Process.

One difficulty in definitely apprehending our problem consists in the fact that it is not yet fixed or stationary, but is still in the process of evolution. We are not dealing with the ripe fruit as the culmination of a long series of growths, but are in the midst of the most active development. Various features of the question now agitating the public are of recent origin. The forces at work have not exhausted their resources, but are likely to be cumulative in their strength. Wherever we look we behold life and movement and expansion, in social affairs; and so long as we are occupied with seeds and germs and buds, all unfolding inherent tendencies and pushing beyond themselves to something contained potentially and prophetically, but not yet actually evolved, we only stultify ourselves if we imagine that we seize as finished a problem which in reality is still changing. A glance at social literature shows that yesterday's definitions may be antiquated to-day and superseded to-morrow.

We give a definition of science and it remains valid for all times. But we distinguish this general definition of science from the scientific attainment of any particular age. I may know what science is and yet not know what evolution had been attained by science in 1825. By the Social Problem we mean the supreme social concern ; but in order to find the Social Problem of our day we must inquire into the supreme social concern of our times. Our inquiry is therefore of an historical nature. The Social Problem of this age need not be the same as that of the preceding. But if the Social Problem of our time is to be defined we must distinguish between its permanent and variable elements. If our definition is to have abiding value it must grasp the essence of the problem, the principle, not something accidental ; the substance of the unfolding seed, not a fading leaf or a bit of bark.

The Labor Question.

Frequently the labor question is identified with the Social Problem. In this there is a mingling of truth and error. Labor has become singularly prominent and its demands are absorbing public attention. But if the question of labor is all that is involved, why call it the *Social* Problem? Fathom the meaning of the labor question; learn how it concerns not merely laborers but the whole of society and all social interests, the highest as well as the lowest; and it will become evident in what sense the labor is the Social Problem. Very naturally the labor problem is concerned chiefly with material affairs ; but the Social Problem as the chief concern of society gives labor its proper place, yet also considers other objects; it recognizes the material foundation on which society rests, but also the superstructure which is to be reared on this foundation. Then, the labor question seems to concern laborers only; but the Social Problem is social because it affects all parts of society. The

fact that laborers have taken the initiative in the social movement has made it appear as if their peculiar affairs were alone involved; but the problem which agitates them has been found to be the problem of society itself and has enlisted the thoughts of eminent thinkers and sociological specialists. Every deeper and broader view shows that labor is only a part of the question we are investigating, though many of the interests involved concern labor most intimately.*

So far as laborers are directly concerned especial prominence is given to the following subjects: the improvement of their material, intellectual, moral, and religious condition; the regeneration of unregenerate wealth; the abolition of those cruel social distinctions which prove our boasted freedom and equality legal and nominal, but not actual; the organization of the industries so as to prevent toil excessively burdensome and long, as well as degrading indolence; the destruction of an undeserved and unearned increment, and the appropriation to laborers of the full reward for their exertions; such an insurance of workingmen against accident, sickness, and old age as shall place them and their families beyond want; and then the momentous question how the laboring classes can secure such opportunities as will enable them to partake of that culture which is heralded as the glory of the nineteenth century, and will make them active promoters of this culture. Among laborers themselves it is a question how far these aims can be realized within the present social system, and what can be attained only by means of revolution.

---

* European scholars regard the Social Problem as involving much more than the question of labor. A German writer says: "Of course the Social Problem is not synonymous with the labor problem." Henry de Tourville, in the preface to Ronsier's "The Labor Question in Britain," speaks of "the source, not only of the labor question, but of the whole social question."

Social Inequality.

The very demands which laborers make show that society and all its interests are concerned. We need only go to the root of the matter to discover that the Social Problem springs from the inequality in the social conditions. The violent agitations of the masses receive their inspiration from the fact that certain classes enjoy privileges and opportunities of which the rest are deprived. Wealth is concentrated and affords its possessors leisure, dominion, and luxury; poverty exists and involves toil and sacrifice and suffering. We can imagine a social equality which would make the average condition worse than at present, such as is found in the lower stages of civilization; but the very equality would make the Social Problem of that state different from our present one. With the existing conditions the Social Problem resolves itself essentially to this: *How can the unjust and unnecessary social inequalities be removed and a righteous state of society realized?*

Our problem thus leads to the consideration of the existing inequalities, what they are, how they originated, how far they are justifiable. Are they inevitable? Or are they arbitrary and therefore subject to change?

Limit to Social Equality.

In the past, social subjects have largely been monopolized by dreamers. An ideal equality has found advocates which is nothing but a myth. Men must be taken as they are; and they are not equal by nature, nor are they alike in effort and desert; it is therefore absurd to treat them as the same in capacity or attainment. If the degraded cannot be raised to the position of the exalted, then equality can only be established by degrading the exalted to the level of the base. That means a vulgar standard and an intolerable monotony. Thus the weak who cannot rise to the plane of the strong become the

highest standard in such a state of equality, and this downward leveling would curse the weak as well as all the other members of society. To the lowly the exalted should be the means of aspiration and help. Our problem avoids the social injustice involved in a vulgar level, by discriminating between a true and a false equality; it aims only at the removal of all *unjust* and *unnecessary* inequalities. We ought to add: *so far as possible*; for absolute perfection is not within reach. It is right, and a social necessity, that strength should be superior to weakness, that the pre-eminence should belong to virtue over vice, that intelligence should outrank ignorance, and that economy, sacrifice, energy and noble achievements should be exalted above indolence, gluttony, and baseness. This is the law of nature and of God, and he who opposes it fights the inevitable. Ancient Greek thinkers held that philosophers ought to be the rulers; and every modern thinker must see that there is a diversity of gifts and a variety of social functions, and that the best state of society requires the most capable minds and the best men for the highest and most responsible places. It is not social grades that are objectionable; but it is intolerable to find little men in big niches, to foster conditions which keep capable men in inferior places, and to permit those who have the positions of influence to use them to glorify themselves, while crushing others. We can hardly find a subject which needs more thoughtful discrimination than this one of social equality.

The weak to the work which the weak can do, that is the rule. But this means that the weak who have somehow usurped high places must be thrust down and yield them to the strong. Those inwardly exalted must likewise be exalted externally. This does not, however, imply that the weak are to be continued in their weakness; they ought

to develop the utmost strength. And while the strong are superior to the weak, that superiority is not to be the means of enslaving the weak. The merit and rank of intellect and honorable achievement are to be fully recognized, but as social as well as individual powers. If made a condition for selfish ends, they become the source of the very agitations which now disturb society. No personal excellence does justice to itself unless it acts as a social blessing.

Problems Involved.

When our problem is apprehended as essentially that of the right and wrong of the existing social inequality, we can understand why prominence is given to such questions as the following:

Has every man a right to existence? If so, who shall furnish it in case the individual cannot secure it for himself? Malthus declares that a man may not even have a right to be born into the world. The banquet spread by nature may have no empty plate and no vacant seat left; then society regards the newcomer as an intruder, bids him begone, and will speedily execute its order.

The powers with which a human being is endowed, ought they to be developed? Can the individual insist on the privilege of making the most of himself? The conviction is deepening that, unless a man unfolds his gifts, his life is a failure. William von Humboldt regarded this self-development as the great purpose of life; and James Bonar affirms that the strength of socialism "lies in its appeal to the principle that there is a right of all human beings to the opportunities of developing what is in them, and in its powerful demonstration that such a right is not now realized." *

Is the land God's gift to all, or have certain classes the right of a monopoly in its possession and products? A

* "Philosophy and Political Economy," 393.

question agitating all advanced nations, particularly those in which landlordism makes the land inaccessible to the people.

Has every man a right to employment? Who shall furnish work to the unemployed, society, the municipality, the state, or the nation? The constitution of the French revolution recognized the right of each individual to employment, and the French constitution of 1848 made it the duty of the state to furnish work to those in need of it. In 1884 Prince Bismark stated in the German Parliament that Prussia acknowledges the duty of the state to give employment to the unemployed; but when the performance of the duty was asked for by men out of work, no response was given. For more than a century this question has been discussed, but no one has been able to give a satisfactory answer. Some have declared that it is no question, because it involves an impossibility.

Ought any one to have more than he needs, so long as others not less industrious or worthy lack the necessaries of life? Shall the necessities of all deserving citizens be supplied before any have superfluities and revel in luxuries? It has ceased to be a question whether a righteous man can hoard as a miser or live in wasteful extravagance, while others, without any fault of their own, suffer need. The problem is more and more concentrating itself to this: In view of the existing need and suffering, how much wealth can the true man appropriate to himself and heartily enjoy, and what demands are made on his means by the social condition?

Is private property justifiable? It was severely attacked in the middle of last century; these attacks have continued and grown, and now they break forth with renewed violence. It is surely unfortunate that property and possession are used as synonymous. What the thief possesses may be my

property. Private property is often attacked so bitterly because it may be a possession which rests on fraud, instead of sacred rights. The storms now raging are not likely to cease before the houses built on sandy foundations fall.

Is labor, as claimed by socialists, the source of all value? Is there an unearned increment, the result of exploiting and robbing labor? What relation shall the laborer sustain to capital, the land, and the tools of labor?

Ought individual wealth to be permitted to accumulate indefinitely, growing from generation to generation, and concentrating in a few hands? One need but look at the landed estates in Great Britain and on the Continent to see how realistic and accute this problem is. Intimately connected with it is the question of inheritance. Shall it be limitless or limited?

Might and privilege have everywhere been the makers and executioners of the law; shall this continue to be the case? Especially if selfish trusts and tyrannous monopolies and iniquitous combinations seize the people by the throat, how long shall this species of infernalism be submitted to by the public?

There are questions of a different character also, such as these: How can laborers learn to appreciate the toil, the sacrifices, and the exalted aspirations of the noblemen among our men of means? How can they be taught to discern between an abstract capitalism and the real capitalists, and between the good employer and the insolent taskmaster? When humanity rises in its rage and pours its wrath upon the brutality of wealthy fiends, is it not time to insist that the honest capitalist and humane employer have rights, and deserve credit for the very qualities which make them the target of envy and hatred?

These and numerous other questions which are involved in the existing inequalities will help us to appre-

ciate, in some measure, the depth, the breadth, the complexity, and the difficulty of our problem. As these inequalities pertain to the entire social organism, so the problem affects and concerns all the elements of society, the rich and the poor, the toilers of every class and the idlers of every class, the cultured and the rude, those that have dominion and such as are subjected. No one who thinks need be told that the Social Problem cannot be solved by removing unjust economic and legal inequalities, while permitting false differences of rank and privilege to continue. The righteous equality demanded is co-extensive with human interests, and pertains to the industries, to politics, to culture, to religion, and to all social concerns. When apprehended in its fullness, we see that the problem appeals to the deepest personal and social affairs, as well as to all classes of society. Indeed, we may well question the ability of the human mind to fathom the depth and measure the extent of the problem; certain it is that the ablest specialist cannot grasp all its details.

This makes it evident that our subject involves much more than merely the question of labor and material concerns, and that it is a mistake to suppose that laborers alone are to be considered in its discussion. Laborers are agitated; but the very foundations of society are also shaken and the entire social structure is at stake. Not only are peace and order threatened, but likewise the church, the state, and the modern forms of culture. Our question thus concerns scholars, theologians, economists, statesmen, capitalists, and employers, as well as laborers.

The Definition.

As the result of our inquiry we find that the Social Problem is a question which affects all society, and all social relations and interests, but that labor is the centre of agitation, and that laborers are the principal agitators. Laborers claim to

be the chief sufferers from the existing unequal conditions; but if one member of the social organism suffers, all the other members suffer with it. Taking into account all the facts, we now define our subject more explicitly: *The Social Problem is the question of so transforming society as to establish equitable conditions, with an especial view to the elevation of the laboring classes.*

One or Many Social Problems.

It has been claimed that there are many social problems, such as pertain to religion, morals, education, to government and the industries, and especial emphasis has been placed on temperance, prostitution, woman suffrage, immigration, and the place of the negro, as social questions. But there is equal propriety in speaking of one dominant question as *the* Social Problem. This one problem, however, involves a great many others, as we have seen. It is the nucleus around which other questions are grouped, the focus into which they are concentrated. The Social Problem is the synthesis of numerous social problems.

The Classes Especially Involved.

In making ours the problem of the whole of society we do not want to withdraw attention from the classes especially concerned. As the Social Problem has developed, the interest in it has spread from laborers to the other classes. This process has been more active in Europe than in the United States, the conditions in the former having heretofore given more prominence to social agitations than in the latter. But in the United States also the conviction is rapidly growing that the condition of laborers is a concern of all the social grades. Nevertheless, ours is peculiarly the problem of what are called the "lower" classes. They are naturally most intent on a change in those social conditions which are blamed for their sufferings. We must

not be surprised if in some cases they blame conditions or other persons for faults which are their own. They are feeling their way, often in darkness that is impenetrable. With their limited opportunities, and with the multitude of problems rushing upon them, mistakes are inevitable. We are simply dealing with facts, and cannot stop to consider how far the demands are in each case just. But whatever criticism may be justified, the spectacle presented by the uprising of laborers is grand. To this is due much of the fascination of our problem. The aspiration of the lowly has been aroused, and the mighty impulse to move forward and upward causes dissatisfaction and turbulence. There is sometimes envy of the rich, but that is an incident, not the essence. As the social movement progresses, the aim must be concentrated on the exaltation of the masses, not on the degradation of those now exalted. "It is a law of unvarying force, that when in the nation the low becomes high, it is not by the degradation of the high, but in the elevation of the whole." * This united, persistent, and resolute effort of the masses to secure better conditions presents a spectacle of unparalleled sublimity, reaching deeper and embracing larger multitudes than the French revolution and the emancipation of the American slave.

Efforts at Realization.

In every great historic movement there are hidden forces whose nature is revealed only by the process of evolution. Yet, as stated above, the student may discover the working and trend of forces which are a mystery to the ordinary observer. Interesting as it is to observe the varied social phenomena, it is far more important to penetrate from what is explicit to what is implicit. Much of the work of the investigator consists in determining what the

* Mulford, "The Nation," 274.

Social Problem involves, but which has not yet been fully evolved. If we seize the logic of the social movements we may infer what some conclusions to be reached in the distant future must be. Not the seeming but the meaning of the Social Problem is our aim. Many deeply affected by the social agitation are far from realizing all it means. They touch the circumference, but do not penetrate to the centre. A few decades since social democrats spoke of the problem as "a question of the stomach;" but only the most ignorant now limit it to that.

Sometimes the grand aim in the uprising has been obscured by the means used for its attainment. The aim itself has been only obscurely apprehended; as in all crises, the passions engendered and the rush of conflicting opinions have bewildered men. They demanded change, but did not know just what change was needed. Being confused by the vastness and the complications of the problem, what wonder if the solution, and the means which lead to it, were still more confused. Now one thing is sought, then another; all is tentative, for it is uncertain what will produce the desired result. Those most prominent in the efforts at solution are the very ones who have the fewest advantages of culture, and are least fitted by education and discipline to master the problems which have baffled the inquiries of the educated classes. Naturally the masses make their necessities, their sufferings, their passions, and their prejudices their logic. One must put himself in their place, and feel the intensity of their embitterment in view of their supposed or real wrongs, in order to understand their course. They are one-sided, and their very situation makes this unavoidable; but the other classes are also one-sided and their judgments partial. If now their passion leads the masses to misapprehend the meaning of the problem, if they mistake the nature of the solution, and if their excessive

zeal impels them blindly to seize whatever means seem likely to solve the problem, is it surprising? A demoniac spirit is sometimes revealed, and diabolical means are resorted to for the attainment of the desired equality. The condemnation of this procedure is just; but do the false means resorted to rob the aim itself of its sublimity? Every reasonable investigator discriminates between the end and the means. We can discriminate between the human rights which asserted themselves in the French revolution, and the horrors which were perpetrated in the name of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Our problem is the most fascinating because of unsurpassed grandeur; and no perverted notion respecting its nature or realization can rob the aim of the laboring classes to rise into better condition of its sublimity.

Disciplines Involved.

So far-reaching is our subject that, in some degree, all human disciplines are involved. Thought is not atomic, but organic; and the Social Problem cannot be abstracted or isolated, but must be treated as a constituent part of the great organism of thought, especially of the social organism. Intimately connected with our theme is the whole realm of sociology, considering the nature, the aim, the possibilities, and the evolution of society. The Social Problem lies within the science of society, especially within that part which belongs to social ethics or to social progress.

Psychology is fundamental for our subject as for human affairs in general. While the usual psychology considers the mental characteristics of the individual, we must remember that these are developed and manifested in the various social relations and determine the character of society. We must understand the individual in order to know what thoughts and feelings and volitions will control him in his associations. A social psychology would be

most valuable for our purposes, but there is little hope of its speedy development. In society we see the individual mind in its various relations, and the character of the mind is the key for understanding these relations.

The importance of political economy is too evident to require emphasis. Some treat political economy as itself the social science, and it has actually been called by that name; in that case it absorbs our problem. Socialists of the Lassalle and Marx type, and a large class of laborers, have put the question of the production and distribution of wealth at the basis of the social agitations. However one-sided their theories, it is clear that the Social Problem will never be solved unless by some means there can be a more equitable distribution of labor and its products. Political economy, owing to its intimate relation to the socialistic agitations of the day, has received much attention, and marked progress has been made in the development and application of its principles. It is fundamental for our theme, but not exhaustive.

Not less important is the science of politics. Especial prominence is now given to the relations of the state to the individual and to society, to capital and to labor, to agriculture, to the industries, and to commerce. Far above the ordinary routine of politics rise such vital questions as these for the consideration of statesmen: Whether the law ought not more fully than at present to organize and regulate the industries; whether, in view of the excesses produced by them, the existing individualism and competition should not be confined to legally defined limits; whether the government does not owe more protection to children and women, to the weak and the needy, in the making of contracts and in employment in factories. The land problem, the state control of railroads and telegraphs, need but be mentioned to indicate the relation of politics to our theme.

That religion is deeply involved is evident; particularly are its ethical elements socially significant. We look to religion and ethics to teach what men ought to be to one another. Philosophy, too, is intimately connected with our subject. Lassalle and Marx and Friedrich Engels passed from the school of Hegel to socialism; and throughout the social discussions, philosophical theories and speculations abound. Natural science seems more remote, yet it has powerfully affected the social trend. The social democracy claims to base its conclusions on the scientific attainments of the age, and professes to advance with the progress of science. Its leaders in Germany advocate materialism, hold that a naturalistic evolution will usher in the social millennium, and claim a scientific basis for the socialistic state of the future. Besides all these important disciplines we must lay especial stress on history. The growth of the ages has developed the Social Problem, and that problem can consequently be understood only if its history is known.

All this may serve to give some idea of the depth and ramifications of our theme. Nothing of humanity is foreign to it, least of all anything that pertains to men in their associated capacity. As all the social relations affect our problem, so it in turn affects all these relations.

Social Point of View.

Society is on a voyage of discovery; it is seeking and finding itself. The discoveries already made are among the greatest of any age. What the crusaders found in Jerusalem was far less valuable than what they discovered in European society. The ferment and development at home were the means of greatest progress. The value of the present social crusade consists in the unfolding of the social consciousness. The age is growing more social, and this is the secret of the power of the Social Problem. Men see that it

involves the deepest interests of society, the very interests into which they grew as they crept out of the shell of selfishness, in which they felt cramped. One need but understand the expansion and enlargement of the times to appreciate the fact that the social point of view is constantly growing in importance. The state has come from abstraction to reality, and its social functions are assuming greater proportions. People are beginning to realize that legislatures and governments do not exist solely for soulless corporations, for infamous lobbies which fight the interests of the public, and for particular classes; and it is insisted that they shall discuss taxes, the tariff, the money question, and all the political issues, from the social standpoint, considering how they affect society and its various classes. Not speculation, but the social actuality is the chief concern. Whatever dogmas it holds, the power of the church is estimated by the age largely according to its social functions. In the novel and in all departments of literature especial prominence is given to the description, the relations, the principles, the laws, the needs and the hopes of society. In the press, the pulpit, and in public meetings the same tendency is marked. The interest is marvelous, yet the social leaven has only begun its work; this beginning of the ferment is, however, prophetic of cumulative growth and agitation.

The Crisis.

Deep thinkers and students of the age behold in our times characteristics similar to those which preceded great epochs, such as the destruction of the Roman Empire, the Reformation, and the French revolution: society is passing through a process of disintegration, as if about to return to its atomic elements, with class dominance and class war prevailing, the old ties severed and new bonds not yet discovered, a decay of affection for traditional institutions and a fury for innovations.

Theories wild and violent are advocated, revolution and anarchism are in the air, destruction is preached from the housetops, and infernal violence is lauded as heroism. Many are waiting for some giant Samson to overthrow the two pillars of capital and labor, on which our social structure rests, regardless of the ruin of the temple and of the multitudes that must be crushed by the fall. Discontent has become a system, destruction an organized and growing force. Whatever may be doubtful to our Mephistopheles, he is always the spirit of negation. Millions rise in arms against the present order and vow to disband only when it is overturned. But what shall take its place? The revolutionists are not agreed as to what of the old shall remain, unless they are nihilists and want to make clean work of destruction; nor is there a consensus respecting the new order to be introduced. Everywhere unrest and uncertainty and doubt and anxiety and blind zeal—proofs that ours is a transition era.

As is usual at such times, prophets abound, now foretelling evil, then exciting hope, their optimism apt to be as delusive as their pessimism. Bad men come to the front, their strength and recklessness being their chief recommendation. They are themselves hopelessly distracted and want to put the social world out of joint. Demagogues, the embodiment of the spirit of evil, arise, get control of powerful movements, profess to strike at capital and hit labor, and curse the masses whom they profess to lead. Nothing hurts the cause of labor more than the demoniac powers which speak and agitate in its name. If this cause fails, the chief blame is likely to rest on the devil that sometimes enters laborers, controls their meetings, and damns and dooms their organizations. It is a hard lesson, but it must be learned: Laborers can be the worst enemies, as well as the best friends, of the cause of labor.

Where Found.

Among the characteristic features of our problem is the fact that it prevails in the most enlightened nations. It does not yet seriously disturb semi-civilized countries like Turkey and Egypt, but agitates most of all the advanced peoples of Western Europe and the United States. The agitations are apt to be general, intense, persistent, and resolute, in proportion to the enlightenment and aspiration of the masses. The reason is plain: a man affected by education and culture cannot be content with what satisfies those who are ignorant and brutalized, and he will have hopes and means of realization which they lack. There are elements in the social movements which are characteristic marks of ignorance and of grossness; but everywhere we find among the leaders men of intelligence, of aspiration, and of great energy.

Diversity in Unity.

In the lands of culture the Social Problem has certain common features which are characteristics of the age. These are the international elements of the problem. Everywhere laborers combine and insist on an improvement of their condition. So absorbed are they by what they denounce as cruel treatment, that their grievances become the sphere of their thoughts and feelings. Hatred is cherished toward the factors which are supposed to cause or tolerate their sufferings. This explains their attitude toward the dominant classes, the government, the laws, and the existing institutions. There are degrees in this feeling in different countries, and it is a total misapprehension to suppose that all laborers join in the antagonism to capital and the present social system. But the growth of this antagonism cannot be questioned. Self-help has become the watchword of laborers. Others, it is claimed, cannot appreciate their situation, and either will not or cannot afford the needed relief. Their remarkable energy is explained by the con-

viction that their hope lies in the use of their own resources. Whatever may for the moment engross the attention of laborers, the aim always underlying the agitations in Europe and America is the improvement of the condition of the workmen and their families. With unparalleled unanimity, resoluteness, and enthusiasm they are resolved that, whatever may bend or break, their situation shall be bettered. They demand a decrease in the burdens and hours of toil; that the full value of the product of labor shall be given to the workman, the producer; that consequently there shall be no unearned increment; that those who can, but will not work, shall not eat, at least not the fat of the land; that the excessive social contrasts are a disgrace and a crime, and must end; that labor shall be honored, that insolence to laborers shall cease, and that the best possible advantage for culture shall be given to the toilers.

But with these general features, which reveal the international unity of the social movement, we also find that each country has peculiarities. These depend on race, on historic development, on the government, on the agricultural, industrial, and commercial pursuits, and on the general situation. Thus we find that with the much which the movement has in common in European nations and America, in every land, often in each locality and trade, there are peculiar factors and phases. Thus a titled nobility and a sharp separation of classes, usually characteristic of monarchies, make the problem very different from that found in a republic. We accordingly see that it has distinctive features in Germany and Switzerland, in Austria and France, in England as compared with the Continent, and that in America it is not the same as in Europe. The religious character of the people also has great influence in producing varieties, so that peculiar types are found in Protest-

ant and in Catholic countries. There is, however, unity enough to produce the striking international characteristics named above. But it is one thing to describe the general marks, and quite another to give a complete view of the Social Problem in a particular land.

Labor and Laborers.

There ought to be no difficulty in determining the nature of the labor to be relieved, and the character of the laborers whose condition is to be ameliorated. In its largest sense labor includes all useful exertion as distinguished from indolence, from play, and from wanton destruction. It may therefore be either mental or physical. The king, the statesman, the professional man, the scholar, the capitalist, and the manager may be laborers in the truest and best sense. Their toil can be the severest, the most protracted, and the most useful. There is a strong disposition on the part of social democrats, and also among the masses, to regard manual labor as the only kind worthy of especial consideration. Much said on this subject is calculated to disparage all other kinds of toil, and to separate sharply the intellectual from the manual laborers. Sometimes this means a depreciation of intellectual exertion; and when manual toil is represented as the source of all exchange value, the inference is drawn that other toil has no value. This method of reasoning is most harmful to the manual laborer. It separates him from the other toilers with whom he is in reality intimately connected and who are his natural allies, and it puts him in an attitude of hostility to intellectual pursuits and exertions. Not only are many intellectual toilers harder workers than the average manual laborers, but often they also receive less pay, taking into account the time, the cost and the sacrifice required to fit them for their labor.

A more correct view regards as laborers all who earn their living by work, whether it be that of the head or the hand; all who depend on personal exertion for their livelihood, in distinction from landlords, the capitalists, and the employers, whose rent, interest, or profit supports them. This general definition suffices, though we must at the same time remember that there are laborers who have capital, and that there are capitalists who are laborers. Nevertheless the broad distinction prevails that some depend on the use of capital for their income, others on their personal exertion. It is not, however, strange that we speak of manual laborers as peculiarly interested in the Social Problem. Their toil is usually the most disagreeable and their condition the most lamentable. But the social movement has also deeply agitated scholars and merchants, especially the smaller traders; and we find literary men, members of the nobility, and men of large means, among the socialists. One of the Berlin leaders of the social democracy is reputed to be a millionaire.

Proletariat.

Frequently the Social Problem is represented as concerned chiefly or solely with what are called the *proletaire*. Some of the socialistic leaders, particularly Karl Marx, have done their utmost to include all the laborers under this term, and to make them conscious that they are proletarians. This consciousness has powerfully affected the social agitations. The term proletariat ought to be so defined as to end its present vagueness. Its origin is from the Latin *proles*, which means children; and the Latin *proletarius* was used to designate the poorest class, the laborers, who had no money, but only children with which they could serve the state. The condition of laborers at that time, and the disgrace connected with manual labor, attached to the idea of a proletarian the conception of degradation, of vulgarity, so

that he was regarded as low and debased. So long as labor and laborers are held in the same esteem and occupy the same social position, the term proletariat is applicable to the laboring class, and it has commonly been so applied in different ages. But when labor is dignified and the laboring class exalted, we must either deprive the term proletarian of its degraded meaning, or else cease to apply it to all workingmen. Whoever has more to give than his physical strength and his children, is not one of the proletariat. The word designates a spirit as well as a condition; it stands for what is low and groveling, not merely for poverty. The workman with more than brute force, with intellectual attainments, who loves his country, who has social interests and aspirations, and who recognizes himself as an integral part of the national life, is not a proletarian. His spirit is not low, he himself is not vulgar. And so soon as he acquires a home or any property, he is above the proletarian, not only in spirit, but also in condition. On the other hand, members of the so-called "higher" classes of society may have the spirit of the proletarian, whatever their possessions; and when they lose their possessions they are apt to be the worst proletarians. Members of the nobility and of the aristocracy who are wrecked usually belong to this class. In Germany it is common to speak of the learned and the literary proletariat as by far the most dangerous. They have lost the respect for their class, they are the most powerful agitators, and their very ability is the greatest menace to society and the state.

This certainly suffices to show that all manual laborers are not proletarians, and that all proletarians are not manual laborers. The degradation attached to the term serves to increase the intense hatred toward the other classes on the part of those who designate themselves as proletarians; and their actual degradation is apt to be pro-

moted by the degraded term which they apply to themselves. The real proletariat consists of the dregs of a community, no matter whether they be manual laborers or not; but all who have anything of intellectual value, of noble sentiment, and of high purpose, rise above the degraded populace known as proletarians in heathen Rome, and should never be designated by a name which is a disgrace to them and to all who apply it to them. The professional tramp, the loafer, the idler, the drunkard, the debauchee, are the genuine proletarians. The term laborer may stand for honor, for dignity, and for the highest usefulness; but proletariat designates the rabble. There is no surer and more direct way to revolution and anarchy than to make the laborers nominally and really proletarians.

Other Terms Applied to Laborers.

For understanding the Social Problem it is essential that the laborers, the ones chiefly affected by the problem, be understood. Those designated as laborers in political economy, namely, the manual laborers, are frequently called the "lower" classes. This is unfortunate, since the notion of baseness is apt to be associated with the term. If used at all it should be employed solely in its economic sense or to indicate the social scale. In morals, religion, and patriotism members of the "lower" classes may be exalted above members of the "higher" classes.

Formerly it was common to speak of laborers as the poor, and this is sometimes still the case. In past ages it was more justifiable than at present. Relatively laborers may be poor, but it is a gross insult to class them with paupers. Men strong and vigorous, intent on earning a living, are justly incensed when treated as objects of charity.

Those who worship material success and make it the standard of all excellence, are inclined to look on those

remaining behind in the industrial struggle as weak, unskillful, or as lacking some other essential element for rising. A false application of the law of the survival of the fittest to human affairs always puts the strongest and best at the top, the weakest and worst at the bottom. If the contest depended wholly on men, not on conditions, there would be much truth in this view; but as things now are it is false. Men do not start equal, they do not have the same chances in the competitive race, and therefore the result is not wholly due to individual qualities. The man who inherits a fortune which he could never have earned, has immense advantages over the poor man, and may be at the top industrially and socially, while the latter, his superior in native ability and energy and merit, is immeasurably inferior to him in the social scale. Every one knows that weak men are found in the "higher" classes and strong men in the "lower," just because circumstances and not worth so often decide the conditions of men.

Perhaps the greatest injustice is done by treating criminals as a constituent part of the laboring class—a result, in part, of calling laborers the "lower" class. Pauperism and crime often go together; but the laboring class is by no means the only source of the pauper and the criminal. All classes have their criminals. The separation of worthy laborers from the vicious and the criminal is much needed, and can, perhaps, be best accomplished by labor organizations, in connection with which we shall have occasion again to refer to the matter.

Literature. The most valuable literature is in German, French, and English. This, to say nothing of that in other languages, is very extensive and constantly increasing, so that even specialists cannot master it all. Works on particular parts of the problem will be referred to in the following pages. The aim here is to

name such as will serve as an introduction. The student must not expect to find many books occupied exclusively with the Social Problem and devoted to its thorough and systematic investigation; for the numerous elements which are involved he must rather look to a multitude of books each of which discusses special phases of the subject. Much of the best thought is put in the form of journalistic literature, and the press teems with articles on labor and capital, the condition, the demands, and the agitations of laborers. The personal environment, particularly in industrial centres, affords excellent opportunity for profitable investigation. Owing to the fact that farmers and agricultural laborers are so scattered, it is more difficult to learn their condition from direct inquiry. For understanding the political and economic situation this condition is, however, of great importance. The best work can be done only when personal investigation is connected with the study of the literature which gives the results of the inquiries of others. A valuable list of books on social subjects is contained in a tract by the Fabian Society, London, 276 Strand, "What to Read." The articles on "Labor," "Socialism," and "Political Economy," in the Encyclopædia Britannica, give comprehensive views and references to literature. On "The Social Problem" there is a volume by Professor William Graham, Kegan Paul, London. The same subject is discussed by F. A. Lange in "*Die Arbeiterfrage*," Bleuler, Hausheer & Cie, Winterthur, Switzerland. "Aspects of the Social Problem," edited by B. Bosanquet, Macmillan.

R. Meyer, *Der Emancipationskampf des Vierten Standes*," 2 Vols., Bahr, Berlin, gives an account of the agitations of laborers and socialists in different lands. Works on Socialism, especially on its history, are valuable. Laveleye, "Socialism of To-Day," translated by G. D. Orpen, Field and True, London. Rae, "Contemporary

Socialism," Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., London. William Graham, "Socialism, New and Old," D. Appleton & Co., New York. Ely, "Socialism and Social Reform," Crowell & Co., New York and Boston, with valuable Bibliography. "Fabian Essays" and "Fabian Tracts," Fabian Society, London, the "Essays" also by C. E. Brown & Co., Boston. Contzen, "*Geschichte der Socialen Frage*," Hofmann, Berlin. R. Flint, "Socialism," Isbister & Co., London.

Other works bearing on this and the following chapters: W. T. Thornton, "On Labor. Its Wrongful Claims and Rightful Dues. Its Actual Present and Possible Future," Macmillan & Co., London and New York. T. G. Spyers, "The Labor Question," Scribner's Sons, New York. Walker, "The Wages Question," Henry Holt & Co., New York. The voluminous reports of the English Royal Commission of Labor are valuable, especially Vol. 39, part II., giving an account of the labor problem in Holland, Germany, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, the Balkan States, Italy, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Spain, Portugal, and Russia.

CHAPTER III.

THE CAUSES OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

The Passion for Humanity.

We have found in the Social Problem a synthesis of the great questions which agitate society, with labor as the central theme. The agitation proceeds, not from above, but from below, not from a few dreamers, but from the practical masses. As far back as the middle of the century a historian wrote, "That the movements of this century proceed from the masses, that they have the same common aim, that their course is according to a uniform law—these are the three characteristics which constitute the outer and inner strength of these movements, which demonstrate their naturalness, and which assure us that they are irresistible." * The people are here and demand a hearing. For decades the science of nature has dominated the minds of students; but an intellectual revolution, largely the result of the uprising of the masses, has now made human affairs the chief concern. Without waiting to determine the metaphysical relation of human society to nature, advanced thinkers no longer hesitate to give the pre-eminence to social laws over natural laws. Indeed, it is claimed that nature has gained by being made the minister to the highest purposes, as well as to the material interests, of man, instead of crushing him under the weight of a crass materialism. The popular movements of the age are not exhaustively interpreted by the statement that society has become the absorbing theme; it must also be added that the discovery has been made that the masses are an integral

* Gervinus: "*Einleitung in die Geschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*," 165.

part of society. When we say that the social era is dawning, we mean that the time for the masses, who constitute the majority, has come. The age has risen on the enthusiasm for nature to a passion for humanity; and humanity means sympathy, benevolence, and tenderness, as well as mankind. Human development has grown to the appreciation of the Social Problem. How has this been accomplished?

What is to be Accounted for.

We follow the scientific method which first asks *what* the Social Problem is, then asks *why*. We should place definitely before the mind what is to be accounted for. The fact that a Social Problem exists is not the thing that needs interpretation; all ages have theirs. It is the exact problem as it confronts us, peculiar to our times, which requires explanation. We want to know why the social movements of our age are distinct as compared with those of former times; why society as a totality is affected by them as never before; why the masses of all advanced nations are beginning to form a solidarity in consciousness, in interest, in determination; whence the inspiration of laborers to raise their standard of living and to enjoy the highest advantages of civilization; why labor has come into the foreground, why this persistent and growing unrest of laborers, why the antagonism between them and capitalists, and why the threats to overthrow the state and the existing social system. The attention is thus to be concentrated on the reasons for the existence of the specific Social Problem of our day.

Origin of Problems.

Problems themselves are an evolution of the ages; they mark the progress of humanity. The development of new powers, the discovery of truth, the creation of new ideals, the adoption of new methods, the dawning of a new hope, break through the monotonous crust of traditionalism and make

demands which past acquisitions cannot meet. A question of adaptation then arises : how the old condition of things, which projects itself into the present, can be harmonized with the new truth and the higher ideals. In periods of marked intellectual activity the ideas and aspirations outrun the development of social institutions, and the pioneers of civilization always come in conflict with traditional petrifactions. " Intellect is energy, great equally in discovering as in solving problems." The advances of humanity consist largely in the evolution of new questions which insist on new answers. A problem is not presented by a condition deemed right, satisfactory, inevitable, and final. Revolutions to overturn monarchies do not arise so long as the divine right of kings is universally accepted. If the highest nobility is believed to come by birth, the nobility of character and achievement will necessarily be regarded as subordinate. Make slavery a natural and social necessity, as is done by Plato and Aristotle, and there is no problem respecting the emancipation of the slave. Laborers are inevitably doomed so long as they and the other classes regard their doom inevitable. But when what was formerly thought to be good is found to be an evil; when a supposed right is recognized as a wrong; and when what was held to be inevitable is seen to be changeable and to demand change: then a problem arises. It becomes a question how to right the wrong, how to change an unsatisfactory condition into a satisfactory one. In the nineteenth century American slavery became impossible; and at the close of the century conditions of labor are pronounced intolerable which were formerly tolerated. The age has grown into the Social Problem and is developing with the problem itself.

Problems as the Ages.

As the ages so their problems. In each age the character of the problem is determined by the character of the age, by the culture attained, by the ideals prevalent, by the laws and customs, and by the general conditions in which society lives. A tribe of hunters and of fishermen is not affected by the land problem of an agricultural people; an industrial city is agitated by other problems than a community of farmers. Where all are laborers the problem cannot be the same as where some are toilers and others idlers. It has peculiar phases where slavery prevails, where serfdom is established, and where all men are nominally free.

History of Labor.

The causes of the Social Problem would be much more apparent if we had a history of labor, giving that process of development which has culminated in the labor question of the day. Not only is this history unwritten but its records are meagre. Caligula expressed the opinion of many ages of antiquity when he declared the kings gods, but pronounced the people cattle. Historians have been intent on giving an account of monarchs, statesmen, generals, and even of court fools and mistresses; but the masses were regarded as existing for the favored few, and as unworthy of attention except as toiling for the other classes and perhaps as targets for spears and for cannon. Not to the remote past is this view confined. Sismondi is said once to have asked Ricardo, "What! is wealth then everything? are men absolutely nothing?" We are told that according to Ricardo "the laborer is regarded not as a member of society, but as a means to the end of society, on whose sustenance a part of the gross income must be expended, as another part must be spent on the sustenance of horses." This contains much of the essence of the teaching of his-

tory with respect to laborers. But while throughout the orient, also in classic Greece and Rome, in the Middle Ages, and down to our own time labor has borne the stamp of degradation, we find that it was the rule of those on the summit of humanity to cherish a far more exalted view. From Moses to Paul, from Buddha to Mohammed, the religious and moral teachers esteemed labor and sympathized with laborers. But the general feeling of the favored classes towards the toilers was that of apathy or of contempt. The personality was not appreciated for its own sake, and the laborers were treated as machines or brutes, with whose uses their labor had a similarity. Even when the slavery of antiquity and the serfdom of the Middle Ages ceased, something of the slave and the serf still attached to the workman.

History and the Age.

Labor has, however, made its own history, though it remains unwritten. This history, together with the dominant factors of the age, has produced the Social Problem. Fortunately, traces enough of that history are preserved to give us a sufficient outline of the modern development which has worked so effectively for the production of our problem. And when we come to our own age we find that certain factors of our times have been especially potent in its evolution. We must seize these specially potent factors, without ignoring the other forces working in our time. The age is ripe for our problem, expresses itself in it, and for that reason ours is the problem of the age. As the spirit of the age has put itself into the problem, so all who have that spirit are interested in the problem. Individuals may, of course, ignore it and claim that the condition of the masses is not their concern, just as Cain can ask: "Am I my brother's keeper?" and as Pilate can wash his hands to prove himself innocent of the blood of the Just One. The

question is worthy of the murderer of his brother, and the hypocritical deed is worthy of him who delivered up Innocence to crucifixion.

Human Nature.

Heretofore men have projected their own views into historic processes, because certain preconceived notions of human nature were made the interpreters of history. While avoiding this serious error we must not forget that the failure to take certain well known laws of that nature into account will unfit us for understanding the full import of our problem. These laws involve the struggle for being and for well-being. The very fact of existence seems to involve the effort at a continuance of existence and to make it prosperous. The struggles we see about us, so far as innate in human nature, are inevitable; so soon as a certain degree of development is attained and the proper conditions are given, the efforts to rise are irrepressible. Hegel held that what men are in idea they are to become actually; their potentiality is to become reality. The oak is in actuality what the acorn is only potentially. No evolution can make men foreign to themselves; only what they are ideally or potentially can they become really. The social movement is not only a manifestation of the energy of human nature, but also of an energy that must work. So soon as the necessity of the Social Problem is recognized, all efforts to repress the human nature manifested in it will appear absurd. The development of human nature means the development of the upward social movement.

Twofold Change.

The changes in the process of development which most of all affect our problem are twofold, namely, the change of the conditions in which men live, and the change which has taken place in the laborers themselves. The times have changed, and the laborers have changed with them. We shall first con-

sider briefly the change in the conditions, a change which puts modern times in such marked contrast with the Middle Ages as well as with antiquity.

Modern Method of Production.

Of the vast changes which have taken place since men's conception of the world was enlarged by the discovery of America none has more affected industrial pursuits than the improvements in machinery and the introduction of steam. Although the change thus wrought has taken place chiefly within a century, the whole method of industrial and commercial pursuits has been more altered than during all the centuries of previous history. The revolution consisted in turning over to machinery work formerly done by hand. Thought has been put into a machine, and now that thought works as a natural law to do the bidding of man. Not only is there a great saving of manual labor, but work is also done with an ease and a speed which were formerly impossible. The saving of expense is enormous. It has been estimated that in England the work of a horse costs ten times as much as that of a steam engine, while that of a man costs ninety times as much. England and the United States have the greatest steam power in the world, the latter absolutely the most of any nation, but the former the largest amount in proportion to population; this explains their supremacy in the world's industries. We are told by Munhall that, "comparing energy with population, ten English or Americans are equal to twenty French or Germans, twenty-six Austrians, forty Spaniards, sixty Italians, or sixty-eight Portuguese, even though the foreigners in question be as intelligent as our people." *

"History of Prices," 54.

Change in Capital.

The man who at the beginning of this new era introduced machinery gained an enormous advantage over a competitor who had only manual labor. The latter could not produce so economically, so speedily, or so extensively, and therefore was soon driven out of the field of competition. Probably nothing was left for him but to become the employee of the owner of machinery. Capital naturally accumulated, and concentrated in the hands of those who controlled the machines and the markets. Even among these the advantages were greatly in favor of such as possessed the best and most powerful machinery. A machine of one hundred horse power may be more than five times as valuable as a machine of twenty horse power, because its force can be used to better advantage; but it need not cost five times as much in fuel and management. The large establishment produces more economically, fills orders more rapidly, and has the advantage in advertising. All other things being equal, the profit of the owner will be more than five times as large as that of the owner of the smaller establishment, while his personal expenses need not be larger. The tendency of machinery is therefore such as to take the place of manual labor; the owners control the trade and secure the profits. But another process of concentration is constantly going on: the large establishments drive the smaller ones out of the market and absorb the trade and the profits. There is thus a natural economic process which promotes monopoly. Hence the marvelous concentration of capital. Formerly wealth consisted chiefly in lands handed down from generation to generation; but in modern times most of the large fortunes were made in the industries. In England the growth of wealth has been mainly by means of industrial pursuits; and in the two countries which have the most machinery,

England and the United States, the concentration of wealth has in recent times been peculiarly rapid and great.

The Factory.

The factory is much older than the middle of the eighteenth century; but before that time it was the exception, since then it has become the rule, in the industries. Before the factory became prevalent the labor was usually performed in the home or in a shop. In the domestic industries, such as spinning, weaving and knitting, the whole family took part; the labor in the shop was usually performed by a single man or a few laborers. The products were chiefly for domestic consumption or for the immediate neighborhood. England and other countries before the reign of machinery which took laborers from the home and the shop to the factory, where the power was concentrated, produced mainly for home consumption. With the increase of production by improvement in machinery and by the introduction of steam the commerce of nations with one another was vastly promoted—the world-market taking the place of the home-market.

Change in Labor

The complete revolution in the methods of production and distribution produced great changes in the work, the position, and the relations of the laborers. They entered a new world, and were obliged to reckon with conditions entirely new. Before water and wind and animals and steam became the chief powers and made the factory a necessity, the workmen produced on a small scale, and, as a rule, the capitalist and laborer were united in the same individual. At the international conference for the protection of laborers held in Berlin, 1890, the French delegate, Delahaye, stated that during the Middle Ages there were ten masters to one wage-earner, whereas now there are in the United States, Great Britain and France twelve wage-

earners to one employer of labor. Whether this estimate be correct or not, the workman in former times usually owned the tools of labor and the raw materials; what he produced was his own, he took pride in it as the product of his exertion, and when it was sold the whole price went to him. Now the rule is that one man is the capitalist and another the laborer; one man owns the buildings, the tools, and the raw materials, while another owns nothing but his power to work. He brings his strength into the market and sells it to the capitalist; but he necessarily goes with his strength. He must live; but in order to live he must use tools of labor and raw materials, and these belong to another. He is free; but to save himself from starvation he is forced to become the employee of another on such conditions as he can make. It is personal freedom without the conditions for the exercise of that freedom, except within the limits which his necessities and which capital allow. Modern labor is in a state of subjection which in certain circumstances, particularly in the Old World, becomes actual slavery. The laborer sells his labor for a wage; the product of his exertion goes to another. Thus we find that not only are capital and labor divorced, but also labor and its product. What the workman once delighted in because not only his own workmanship but also his own property, is now the work of a machine, has no direct value for the laborer, and therefore he may take little interest in it, and his work becomes mechanical, that of a routine often deadening in its very monotony. What the hands once wrought with careful skill is now committed to a lathe whose attendant, companion, or servant the laborer has become.

Intellectual Effect.

Much has been written about the effect of the modern mode of production on the intellectual character of laborers. Among specialists the conviction has become quite prevalent that machinery puts the laborer at a disadvantage intellectually, compared with former times. The question is difficult, so many factors besides machinery affecting the intellectual character of the modern laborer. The same skill may not be developed in the operative if the machine performs the work which was formerly done by hand; but other skill which was then neglected is now required and developed. Different kinds of machinery develop different intellectual qualities. Some of the human labor demanded is of the dullest, most mechanical kind. A child can perform it and remain a child. Other labor requires more skill and tends more to develop the intellect. The result necessarily depends largely on the laborer. The attention formerly devoted to manual work can now be given to the machine, to its construction, and its operations. More time can also be taken to think of the various objects of interest to workingmen. But the dull and stupid will find no impulse in their mechanical routine to intellectual growth. The tendency in modern machinery is to the development of a different character of intellect from that which formerly prevailed. The superiority of modern laborers to those of the past is largely due to other causes than machinery. It surely would be far more difficult for our laborers to execute by hand the ordinary work of the guilds of the Middle Ages, than for a member of those guilds to do the ordinary work of our industrial laborers. There is, however, much modern labor which requires skillful workmen. The skill thus developed, which fits the laborer for a special task, may be of no service when he is thrown out of that particular employment, not being pre-

pared for other kinds of work. So much of the labor being now transferred to machinery whose production is a constant reproduction of the same articles, there is less opportunity than formerly for the laborer to impress his individuality upon the product. He has become an observer and a helper, rather than an initiator or creator. He is, however, relieved of much labor which he was formerly obliged to do, heavy work is done for him which human power alone found impossible, and in delicacy and accuracy the machine also surpasses human skill. Whatever thought may be transferred from the laborer to the machine, the very relief it gives by performing work for him may enable him to exercise his thoughts more diligently in other directions.*

Capital Reproductive.

So far as the laborer is concerned there have evidently been gains and losses by means of the great industrial revolution; but taking all things into account, including the fact that he is a consumer as well as a producer, the laborer has been a gainer with the rest of the community. Whether his gain is as large as that of the capitalists and employers is another question; so it is an entirely different question whether he gets the full value of his labor. How difficult it is to balance the advantages and disadvantages may be inferred from the fact that J. S. Mill questioned "if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any human being." Relative to capital we find labor after the revolution in the industries

* "The Labor Question in Britain," by Paul de Rousiers, shows that the modern method of production tends more and more to dispense with skilled labor. The peculiar skill for a particular trade formerly required of the workmen is now transferred to the machine. Hence long apprenticeship in learning a trade is no longer common as it was before the days of machinery. "What is required from the worker to-day is not so much the special aptitude for a particular trade as the qualities which go to make a man." Preface VIII.

in many respects at a decided disadvantage. Capital is reproductive. One hundred dollars on interest will, in the course of time, become two hundred, the two four hundred, and so on indefinitely. The same process is at work when money is so invested as to produce profit or rent. One penny becomes a pound, one pound becomes a thousand, one thousand pounds grow to a million. This law must be taken into account when capital and labor are compared. Capital works for its owner, and all it grows into works likewise for him, if also turned into capital. The laborer, however, usually depends on his wage; he consumes it. What he earns is used for himself and his family. It may produce and sustain strength, but the earning itself does not grow. The dollar earned does not become two dollars, but itself disappears. This important law explains the growth and the concentration of capital, and the continuous poverty of the poor. Poverty has other causes, but this law must be considered as of great importance. The law which increases capital ought somehow to be applied to the wage; that ought to grow in the same proportion. The laborer ought to be able to turn a part of his wage into capital. In other words, society ought not to consist of two classes of unequal advantages, but of only one class, a class in which capital and labor are united. Something is wrong in a condition in which capital involves more capital, and labor involves only more labor. That condition becomes intolerable in proportion as it is realized.

Division of Labor.

Specialization in work is a natural process in the progress of the industries. Originally the same family raises the wool, spins and weaves it, and wears the manufactured garments. But in the course of time it becomes more advantageous for one to raise the wool, for another to transport it, for a third to spin it, for a fourth to weave it, and for others to

make it into garments and sell them. This process of specialization was greatly promoted by the introduction of machinery, and a minute division of labor is one of the characteristics of the modern system of production. We might call this the disintegration of labor. Formerly one man made the entire watch, piece by piece, putting together the whole at last; and he was the owner of his product. But the machine cannot turn out the whole watch at once, nor can the same machine proceed to make one part after another. Each separate process in the making of a watch requires a special kind of machinery. A hundred or more men may now be required to make the numerous parts which constitute a watch; not one of them may be able to put the watch together after the parts are finished; and not a worker has any ownership in the watch when completed. Thus laborers are not merely divided according to the distinct trades, as formerly, but in the same trade minute divisions between the workmen prevail.

Co-operation of Labor.

With the much written on the modern division of labor it is strange that an equal emphasis is not placed on the modern co-operation of labor. If a man makes the entire watch he is independent of other laborers; all other watch-makers may rest from their work and he continue to make watches. But now all engaged in making the watch are co-operative and depend on one another. If those who make a spring or a wheel strike, all the rest will be unable to finish the watch. Every factory is a co-operative establishment, the laborers work into each others' hands and are dependent on one another. Thus the division of labor also means a new organization of labor. The inter-dependence and co-operation of laborers have brought the workers nearer each other; and the ties which actually unite them help to explain the modern solidarity of laborers and their union of effort.

Concentration of Laborers.

We must also consider that the modern mode of production has promoted the concentration of laborers in factories and cities. Not only has the factory largely taken the place of the home, but the tendency of population has also been towards the centres of production. Hence the rapid growth of cities during the nineteenth century. Not only were the industries more distributed in former times, because more domestic, but the relations of laborers to one another were different. Guilds were common in the cities, and all the artisans of a place belonged to them. These guilds constituted a kind of brotherhood, the aim being to make that which concerned any member the concern of all. Such was their strength that the other classes and even courts were obliged to reckon with them. They gave dignity to their trades, they strengthened the workmen, protected and helped them in time of need, and served to promote the excellency of the articles produced. The apprentice entered into intimate relations with his master, usually lived with him, and had strong hopes of becoming a master himself some day. The whole industrial arrangement retained many of the characteristics of the family. But now the industrial toilers are massed in cities, large numbers of them being away from home and without family connections. However health and comfort may be affected, the strain on the character is great. Laborers are thrown together in large factories, and this association takes the place of home and other companionship. They discuss their grievances and make their discontent contagious. When their number runs up into scores of thousands in a city, what favorable conditions for agitation! They naturally combine for various purposes, and thus in a measure form a substitute for the ancient guild. When now we take into account all the modern means of

communication, the press, the mail, the telegraph, the railroad, and the steamship, we can see how readily a local movement becomes national, and then leaps over mountains, continents, and seas, and becomes international. The modern conditions make possible coalitions, agitations, and tendencies, which were formerly impossible.

Displacement of Laborers.

By means of inventions there has been a constant process of transferring to machinery work formerly done by hand. Less laborers were therefore required and thus large numbers thrown out of employment. This led to numerous riots in the beginning of this century, particularly in England. The effect of the displacement was felt most keenly immediately after the introduction of new machinery. Sometimes new inventions, as the telegraph, created a new line of industries and gave employment to many laborers. In other cases laborers were in demand for manufacturing the new machinery, for the increased production, and for the transportation and sale of the goods. There has thus been compensation; just how much, it is, however, impossible to tell. Statistics show that relatively more laborers are now employed, say in the United States, than fifty years ago. But this may in part be accounted for by the fact that now is committed to factories work that was formerly done in the home, so that statistics report laborers which before were not reported. If the laborers have actually increased in larger ratio than the population, it would probably suggest very unfavorable inferences. It might be concluded that conditions have grown more unfavorable, and for that reason more are obliged to labor than formerly, especially women and children; or that capital has become concentrated in fewer hands, and that therefore some formerly both capitalists and employers are now laborers. So far as the data are within reach

we cannot tell just how much compensation for the displacement of laborers by inventions has taken place by the new work created by these inventions. Labor has in many instances been lightened and the hours of toil have, in general, been lessened. While we cannot question that the laborer has been benefited by inventions, the lion's share has evidently not fallen to him.

Women and Children.

As machinery lightened labor, much of the work formerly performed by men could now be done by women and children. These, therefore, just as the men, entered the factories. Women took the places of men, and children took the places of women. Often both the parents and the children were in the factories, which necessarily had a great influence on the character of the home and on the home life. Women usually work cheaper than men, and frequently the latter were altogether displaced or else had to accept the wages of women. In a number of employments the cheaper labor of women is taking the place of the dearer labor of men. This element of competition among laborers themselves, of men with men when labor is scarce, and of men with women and children, and of these women and children with one another, has greatly complicated the labor problem. Mr. Hobson shows that in ten leading English industries the increase of male laborers from 1841 to 1891 was 53 per cent., while that of women was 221 per cent. "In textiles and dyeing there was a continuous decline in the absolute numbers of adult male workers and a continuous increase of female workers up to 1881. In 1851 there were 394,400 men employed, in 1881 the number had fallen to 345,900, while the women had risen during the same period from 390,800 to 500,200." *

* "Modern Capitalism," 293.

There are too many factors which enter into the matter to determine exactly the effect of the transference of labor from the home to the factory on the character of the laborers. Although the home life has lost much of its former importance, the character of the laborers as well as their material condition has undoubtedly improved in many respects. Just how much of this is due to the general intellectual and moral advance of the people, and how much to machinery and to the congregation of laborers and the greater publicity of labor, cannot be estimated.

Other Changes.

The revolution in the mode of production has changed commerce as well as the industries. Formerly the market, as we have seen, was local and national, extending but little beyond the people who produced the wares. This has been changed by modern inventions. Thus in connection with the vast increase in production we have the introduction of the modern means of transportation. The world is now the market for the productions of the leading industrial nations. Within a century inventions and the use of steam have transformed beyond all power of description the industries, the commerce, and the business of the world.

Over-Production.

The capacity for production seems almost unlimited. It is impossible, with present statistical methods, to determine the exact relation of supply to demand. The needs of the entire world must be taken into account. Not only must the manufacturers of a locality, a state, or a nation be considered, but the manufacturers of all nations. All are rivals and competitors. In this strife of fierce competition, each trying to gain an advantage over the rest, there is a natural tendency to outdo one another in cheapness of production. In this effort labor is often the sufferer. The special demand for an article, as bicycles, for instance, leads to the

greatest possible production on the part of existing establishments and to the erection of new plants. This course usually proceeds until there is over-production. From this both capitalists and laborers suffer, most of all the latter, on account of their pecuniary condition and their dependence on labor for support. When over-production is general we have those periodical financial crises which so disastrously affect the business of modern times. Thus employment becomes uncertain and irregular; this leads to fear, to discontent, and to agitation. Men strong and faithful, by dint of hard and constant toil keeping their families in home and food and raiment, are suddenly thrown out of work and reduced to want. This fact adds greatly to the complications of our present condition. Perhaps nothing more fully reveals the helplessness of the situation than that men able and anxious to work are obliged to beg for work and to depend on charity for support.

Æsthetic Effects.

While it is admitted that on the whole the modern industrial system is a benefit to the laborers, the evil influences, whether due to the system itself or to its abuse, ought not to be disguised. A writer is here quoted who gives a careful discussion of the effect of the modern method of production, and comes to the conclusion that in the main it is beneficial. In one respect, however, he thinks it decidedly injurious. R. W. C. Taylor says respecting the æsthetic effects: "From this point of view there is scarcely a word to be said in favor of the modern factory system. It vulgarizes the product, it stultifies the workman, it deteriorates the public taste; the very buildings in which its operations are performed, the emanations they emit, give an added gloom to life. . . . It was not foreseen how completely the gospel of cheapness would swamp all others. Now this is a very serious defect, and the question arises, is it inherent in the

factory system, or only one of those remedial evils which have to a great extent been cured in other parts of it. As far as present experience goes it is inherent in it. There are many beautiful fabrics made in factories, and the perfection to which some machinery is brought—the separate parts of which are factory made—often strikes one with admiration. But there is no ideality in the work, it is all painfully, obtrusively utilitarian. The quality of ideality seems indeed to have fled so far from us as to have come to be looked upon at length even with disdain. Yet there is almost nothing which we can afford to part with less. Without the perception and love of beauty, and the sentiment of its appreciation, it is impossible to produce the finest work. Mechanically perfect it may be, but it will not be the best work that could be done even by the same machines, while the highest quality of all will be wanting in the conception and construction of new ones. It is difficult to imagine a more hopeless lot for our operative population than to be engaged in such labor; nor a more dangerous one. Will those workers, with ever-increasing knowledge and power, be long satisfied to abide in the darkness of such a life, or will they not some day issue forth and organize a great catastrophe? Intellectual improvement will not necessarily help us here; for it is just as likely to impel to discontent as quell it. Morality may not prove a sufficient defence; for who shall say on which side the higher morality is?—the teachings of the great moralists of all mankind have been universally with them. The old domestic virtues will not save us; for these have been sacrificed at the shrine of gain. If our present factory system is to last (which is by no means certain) the effort to make the lives of the working people brighter and better worth living should be earnestly and continuously made." *

* "The Modern Factory System," 442-3.

Whatever interest may be attached to the comparison of the advantages of the factory system with those of the methods it superseded, the consideration of evils like the above has far more practical value. It is the evils connected with the present system which occasion the agitations and revolutionary efforts of laborers.

Names.

The above are leading features of the modern industrial system. In their details and ramifications the transformations wrought by the modern methods of production are far greater than can be described. The names used for this system are significant. It is called the factory system, or the era of machinery and steam and electricity. The prominent part played by capital has made this the age of capitalism. Competition also expresses one of the most marked characteristics of our industries. This is likewise the age of individualism, because the control of business has been freed from legislative enactments and committed to individual enterprise. Ours has also been called the era of political economy, that discipline having been marvelously developed in connection with the existing industrial system.

In considering the characteristics of modern industries it should not be forgotten that their introduction is quite recent, that numerous factors have but begun their processes of development, and that no one can foresee what evolution will take place in the future. Whatever may be attributed to natural law in this process of evolution, the good or evil results will depend materially on the course of capitalists and laborers.

Change in Laborers.

Important as these considerations are and much as they have to do with the Social Problem, they are not the only factors which have worked for its production. We cannot agree with the European and American writers who so emphasize the modern industrial system and the eco-

nomic situation of laborers as to make them the sole causes of the problem. They are rather conditions, while for the immediate causes we must look elsewhere. Let us suppose that during the century the material condition of laborers has improved fifty per cent., but their aspiration one hundred per cent.; then we can understand why, with their improved condition, they are nevertheless more restless than before. Some writers argue that laborers ought to be content, because more favorably situated than formerly; but they fail to see that if the Social Problem has arisen in spite of the fact that the condition of laborers has improved, then this condition alone cannot have produced the problem. Were the Social Problem solely the product of the unfavorable condition of the laborers, then it ought to have been most prevalent when that condition was the worst. In order to understand the social agitations of the day we must especially emphasize the change in laborers themselves, not merely their changed circumstances. The laboring classes have changed; therefore we have the Social Problem. The change they have undergone must of course be considered in connection with those external transformations which make our times modern in distinction from former ages.

Education.

In the recent processes of evolution the laborers have had a large share, and in some respects the changes have most of all affected them. The enlightenment has been general, and the illumination has been most perceptible in the darkest places, namely, among the masses. Many of the transformations which have taken place can be put under the general head of education. The Middle Ages were not as dark intellectually as many suppose, nor were the people wholly without education. Their intellectual aspirations are evident from the opposition to them. Dr Stubbs * states that a petition

* "Constitutional History of England," III., 622.

was presented to the English Parliament in 1391 asking "that villeins may not be allowed to send their children to the schools," and a few pages further we read of "the sneer of Walter Map, who declared that in his days (the twelfth century) the villeins were attempting to educate their ignoble and degenerate off-spring." But both in England and on the Continent the education of the people was very limited. A change for the better took place with the invention of printing and with the impulse for the education of the people given by the Reformation. It is only in recent times, however, that we can speak of the actual education of the masses. Not only do they now learn letters and numbers, and the ability to read and write, but they also get a taste for higher culture and share some of its benefits. General education has taken the place of the intellectual monopoly of the select few. Intellectual culture is the great elevator and likewise the great equalizer. It takes men as men, regardless of rank and station, and develops them according to inherent possibility and native energy. Education as much respects the mind of a pauper as of a prince; perhaps it puts the pauper intellectually on the throne and makes the prince his subject. Epictetus was a slave, yet what a prince!

Means.

We need not dwell on the agencies for that enlightenment which has so powerfully affected the masses. Even the illiterate of our day, who can neither read nor write, are not like the illiterate of former ages. Culture does not depend exclusively on letters. The school has, nevertheless, been a factor of peculiar power. Its sphere of instruction has been enlarged, its methods have been improved, it has been made common, and not only has it opened its doors to all, but attendance has been made compulsory. So greatly has the value of education appreciated that it is deemed essential for the

safety of the state as well as for personal welfare. The press has grown in power and extent, and is the most efficient auxiliary of the school, bringing the thought and news of the world to the hut as well as to the palace. Ideas have become cosmopolitan, communistic. The various trades and labor organizations also have their special journals which discuss subjects of particular interest to laborers. Besides the vast and ever-increasing literature devoted especially to the concerns of workingmen, we find that the severer and more abstruse subjects of learning have been popularized. Thus science, philosophy, theology, history, have been brought in popular forms to the masses. But a still greater educator of the people has been the university of life with its vast modern concerns and its multitudinous interests.

Politics.

The political changes have been among the most powerful factors both in enlightening the laborer and increasing his power. No less in politics than in education has the monopoly of the few ceased. Not only in republics, but also in all enlightened monarchies the people now have a share in the legislation and the government. It is hard to conceive what fetters have thus been burst. The vision and the interest of the laborer have been enlarged. The affairs of state, with which formerly he had nothing to do, are now his immediate concern. Not only has he the ballot, but he may be elected to legislatures and parliaments; and not only are scores of laborers among the law-makers of the first nations, but the workmen are actually striving to secure the control of national affairs.

Epochs.

Certain epochs in history have been especially effective in producing these changes. The most marked beginning was made when Christianity broke the power of the old world and inaugurated a new

era of development, with new ideas. The emphasis of persons above things by Jesus Christ, the dignity of man which He taught, and the love which He lived and was, have been the dominant thoughts of the best men in the Christian ages.* The reformation in the sixteenth century sought to pick these gems from the rubbish of tradition and to give them the place assigned them by their author. In that epoch the liberty of man, the right of reason and of conscience, and the exaltation of the people, were dominant aims. Revolutions are culminations of thought and may be creators of new movements. The American revolution put into a concrete national form the ideas of freedom and republicanism which had long haunted the mind and had found expression in literature; and the French revolution was an indignant judgment on the untold crimes accumulated for ages, a revolt against the rank and privilege and tyranny which were inherited from feudalism and made Louis XV. possible, and an attempt at the deification of liberty, equality, and fraternity. But in that hour of the world's history labor had not become the modern Hercules. The French revolution was essentially an effort of the third estate to gain the ascendancy; the fourth estate, consisting of the laborers, was used for this purpose, but its emancipation was neither the chief aim nor the result. The ideas for which that epoch stands require a long process of development for practical realization; even now what was then projected and planned remains an aspiration rather than an attainment. But the thoughts embodied in that

* "The Athenian regarded himself as free, a native Roman citizen was free by birth. But that man as man is free, according to his very nature, that he is born free, was known neither by Plato nor Aristotle, neither by Cicero nor the Roman jurists, although this idea is the only source of law. Not until the principle of Christianity was introduced did the idea that the individual, personal spirit is of infinite, absolute worth receive recognition." Hegel, "*Geschichte der Philosophie*," I., 63.

epoch have never ceased to inspire and agitate the nations. The revolutionary agitations of 1848 and at other periods throughout the nineteenth century have but aimed to put into practice what was then proclaimed in the name of the people.

Modern Ideas.

These epochs have at least established certain great principles which dominate modern times and constitute the aspiration and hope of humanity. If in past ages men were darkly impelled by unconscious instinct, they now realize fully and intensely that they possess rights which are innate and inalienable, which inhere in them as human beings, independent of royalty, nobility of birth, and wealth. The very fact that these rights are embodied in the personality involves the right to their manifestation and exercise. Since all men equally have these rights, all men must be equal in their use. Freedom and equality, within proper limits, as human rights, made the social grades and castes of the ancient and mediæval world impossible. The correctness of the ideal was unquestioned; the only problem consisted in respect to its realization. These great ideas not only demand the emancipation of humanity, but are also mighty energies pushing toward that emancipation.

Promotion of These Ideas.

One need but trace the course of history during the last two centuries, study the literature, the institutions, and politics of these centuries, in order to learn how the ideas of man's inalienable rights constitute the foundation of modern thought and the inspiration of modern life. They are embodied in government, control our education, animate our literature, and determine the course of organizations and of popular movements. The pulpit gave especial prominence to the personality and its demands, and advocated the doctrines which have been most effective in the

elevation of man. Laborers were included in this elevating process; indeed, it concerned them more than others. The toiling masses heard the glad tidings proclaimed everywhere, they believed and rejoiced in what they heard, and they demanded their rights. They may now turn their backs on the church, but no other institution has been equally prominent in proclaiming the principles and rights which are the hope of laborers. Laveleye goes so far as to claim that socialism strikes its roots in Christianity, and says: "If Christianity were taught and understood conformably to the spirit of its founder, the existing social organization could not last a day."

Demands of Society.

While the laborer became imbued with the modern ideas and spirit, and made demands corresponding with them, we must not forget their effect on the character of society in general. When the laborer claims certain rights as inalienable he is backed by the advanced sentiment of every enlightened community. It is their admitted justice which makes the claims invincible. As society becomes conscious of itself it makes the just claims of the workers its own. It must deny its clearest principles and holiest convictions before it can believe that any class of men, with no fault or choice of their own, shall be permanently doomed to live a life of unceasing drudgery, deprived of the very privileges and opportunities which give life its value. Much in the old class distinctions is repugnant to reason and conscience, and the only question respecting them is how to get rid of them. No man with the modern idea of the value of the personality can look with equanimity on a contract system which is based on the falsehood that the laborer is merely so much physical strength, that this can be severed from his intellectual and moral being, and that his labor is the sole element of consideration. The laborer

is not a machine or a brute; and as society attains full consciousness of itself and its members it cannot submit to this degradation of the laborers, and of itself through its constituent elements. The progress of society and of the social consciousness is among the most potent factors in the Social Problem. The age which has become humane to brutes, becomes indignant at inhumanity in the treatment of human toilers.

Other Forces.

When we consider the various forces dominant in our age we find others which have been effective in the evolution of our problem. Our times are marked by great energy, both intellectual and practical. Intellect leaps forward to conquer realms of the unknown; and what it masters theoretically it seeks to realize in practice. By realization it means actuality in this life. Religious faith during this century has passed through the severest historical, philosophical, and scientific attacks known to history. The masses have been infected with doubts which were formerly confined to a few minds. In Europe frequent reiteration has made it a platitude that laborers are unwilling to be cheated out of the blessings of this life by the hope of heaven. They have become afraid of subjective notions and have entered with the age itself on the search for objective realism. The reality they are after can be seen and touched, weighed and measured. This tendency was promoted by the dominance of natural science, which banished speculation, put matter and nature in the foreground, and helped, if it did not advocate, materialism, naturalism, and realism. One need but know the dominant forces of modern times to discover their culmination in the Social Problem. The critical character of the age and the trend to realism have produced a mania for the exposure of ills and frantic efforts for their removal.

Wealth.

Ages have their crazes; the greed for wealth is the insanity of our age. Earthly realism and practical materialism bear their most luscious fruit in covetousness. The insane are dominated by the usual unconsciousness of insanity : they are not aware that they are crazy. Intellect, health, character, life itself are sacrificed in this madhouse. Education, literature, art, and the professions spurn the laurel wreath of glory for the sake of bowing before this modern Moloch. Money was intended to be the minister of men, but now men live for money.

Sport.

Connected with this unhumanizing avarice is an inordinate love of pleasure. It has been said but too truthfully that sport sits on the neck of the culture of our age. The powers not exercised in the higher concerns of humanity naturally seek an outlet for their energy in animal gratification. There is a modern heathenism which, in spite of all pretence of culture and refinement, is not a whit more exalted than the ancient orientalism of heathen nations. Selfishness, covetousness, and lust have always been potent factors in human life; but the theoretical materialism has promoted practical materialism, the industrial pursuits with their mad competition have become absorbing as never before, the ideals and the higher interests have been neglected and ignored. The very trend of modern life has promoted greed and luxury and sport, while the counteracting influences have not been proportionately developed.

The Result.

Take all these causes and weigh their effect on the laboring classes. The Chinese walls which kept the social ranks apart have been scaled or broken. Similarity of education has promoted a community of thought, a similarity of feeling, and a unity of tendency. The "lower" classes learned from the

"upper." If money was the chief thing, then they wanted money; and they asked permission to mingle in the frantic crowd of rank and privilege and culture, to worship the golden calf. If pleasure is so desirable, then they too insisted on making it supreme, though in the process of passing from the social top to the bottom some of the gilding and veneering be lost. The spirit of lust is the same, the character does not differ, though the polish at the top may veil the vulgarity and grossness beheld at the bottom. A few decades since, men of culture on the Continent declared that for themselves they did not need religion, but that it was a good thing to keep the masses "in their place." The masses listened, became enraged, vowed that they wanted none of that kind of religion, and resolved to determine "their place" for themselves. The social movement is charged with being besmirched by the filth of materialism and carnal pleasure; but the source of the most potent influence for accumulating this filth has also been discovered. Men have beheld the summits whence descended the debris deposited in the valleys.

The Ideal and the Real.

In order that the situation may be understood we must take into account all the historic processes and all those forces which work so mightily in our age. We must consider the change which has taken place in external conditions and within laborers. We must weigh the modern ideas and their effect in transforming the masses. It is of no avail to demonstrate to our own minds that the masses are wrong; the force that impels them is not what *we* think, but the conviction of their own minds, whether that be true or false. It has been remarked that a false notion held as truth is as effective as a true notion. The laborers have those ideas which are the ideas of the age; and they cherish ideals of which they

cannot be robbed. They have seized the ideas of the rights of man, of freedom, of equality, of the dignity of man as man, of the supremacy of the personality; and from these and in harmony with them they have formed their ideals. These ideals they contrast with the reality. What is the result? They find themselves treated as "helps" or as "hands," estimated, like a machine or a mule, according to the physical service they can render another, not according to the personality or their manhood. When a machine breaks or a mule dies the owner suffers loss; when a laborer is disabled or dies a dozen may be ready to take his place—the change may even be a gain to the employer. The consideration of interest which determined the humane treatment of slaves may be lacking in the treatment of the individual laborer. Laborers are free personally, yet only nominally. They must work, they go with their work, they must work for others, they may have to submit to the conditions offered them, and the enslavement enforced by hunger is real. Many other things convince them that freedom is merely nominal and legal, not actual; it is freedom without room for exercise. The modern aristocracy has the real privileges of the old nobility. The wealth is theirs, the social position and influence, the political power; even their advantages before the law are so great that Justice is often too blind to be able to see the faults of the rich. See how votes are bought, how lobbies are maintained, how public men have their price, how the press is influenced! The very mention of these things at once suggests evils which everybody knows. The purchase of states for a party is reduced to a system, and it may be but a question of money and shrewdness and supremacy of rascality. Even education, particularly in its highest forms, is not so accessible to the masses as to the wealthy. Nor is the contrast between the ideal and the real more appall-

ing when the character of privilege is considered. If wealth meant character, patriotism, statesmanship, and public welfare, the social agitations would be of a different character. It does mean all these in some instances; but it often means selfishness, insolence, miserliness, debauchery, and moral pestilence. The very families from which most is expected are sometimes the most potent agencies in creating our modern Sodoms.

The Outlook.

Connected with this contrast between the ideal of the workingman and the reality there is often an outlook into the future which convinces him that a drearier fate than the present awaits him and his family. Now he struggles hard for a livelihood, is obliged to deny himself much that is desirable, in financial crises and other emergencies may find himself and his family in need of the necessaries of life, and has neither the time nor the strength to share in the best culture of the age. This would be more tolerable if there were hope that a brighter future is about to dawn. But so far as he can see, the concentration of capital is growing, the middle class, which he aspires to enter, is threatened, and the doom that rests on him is hopeless, perhaps even grows more oppressive. The hated tyranny of capitalism seems on the increase, while the dreaded pauperism in case of accident, sickness and old age may appear to him inevitable. And for that family which he loves as intensely and tenderly as the privileged ones can love, for that family he perhaps beholds prophetically a worse fate than his own. If he is mistaken, his mistakes nevertheless determine his course.

Social Science.

One factor we have not even mentioned. During this century our social theories have undergone a change hardly short of a revolution. In this change the modern ideas referred to above have been effective agents; but we must also reckon with

a new discipline which is transforming society. The science of society is still an aspiration, but the study and development promoted by sociology are affecting all the social theories, relations, and movements. Where formerly individualization was the law now socialization absorbs the attention. Men now know that they cannot live unto themselves, no matter how much they may try to do so. The deeper study of society has banished to the realm of fiction many notions formerly treated as axiomatic. Much that was once held to be the inexorable working of natural law and therefore in the grip of fate, or that was treated as a divine decree and therefore the will of God, has been discovered to be a social enactment; as man has instituted so man can change it. The doctrine is as old as Christianity that man is God's steward and wealth a divine trust; but not less evident is it now that wealth is likewise a *social* trust, and that for its use the possessor is responsible to society. In the social factors and social products we now include the laborer and the capitalist, as well as labor and capital, and emphasize their social functions. Society makes wealth possible and valuable; society holds for the rich the wealth which they could not themselves hold for a day; society transmits to the heirs the wealth which the dead hand cannot touch; is it strange then that society proposes to socialize what is inherently social? The sociological trend has discovered a new social world, and insists on possessing what it has discovered.

Equalization.

European scholars have discovered in our times a marked ideal tendency toward equalization. How could it be otherwise with the modern communism in education and politics and ideas and aspirations? If lower castes are a necessity, those who constitute them insist on knowing why they cannot change places with those at the top. "The advance

towards more equal conditions of life has been so great that amongst the more progressive nations such terms as lower orders, common people, and working classes are losing much of their old meaning; the masses of the people are being slowly raised, and the barriers of birth, class, and privilege are everywhere being broken through." This equalizing tendency is naturally most of all manifest in republics, and keeps pace with the movement toward republicanism. Monarchies foster social distinctions which the idea of a republic excludes. On the summits of modern progress those artificial ranks and grades of society become impossible which characterize the old despotisms; and the thrones which rest on such arbitrary distinctions are sure to be swept away by the demands of human rights. Inner royalty is destined to take the place of outer purple, or to be the condition for wearing the purple robe. This law of equalization has the whole energy of human nature behind it and works with a resistless force. Perhaps its unconscious working in modern times is as great a power as its conscious energy.

Socialism.

The Social Problem has given birth to socialism. We cannot stop to discuss the older social theories, nor are they essential for our aim. The views embodied in Plato's Republic, in Augustine's City of God, in More's Utopia, in Campanella's City of the Sun, and in the social romances down to our own times, have an historic interest rather than a practical value for understanding our problem. The actual socialistic movements which began in France at the close of last century are more important for our purpose. The leaders in these movements regarded private property and the laws of inheritance as the main reasons for the existing inequality, and therefore directed their attacks against them. All the older communistic and socialistic theories and their practi-

cal applications aimed to make *social* the advantages which had been confined to a few individuals, and to make *common* the privileges which had been a private or class monopoly. Some form of collectivism is everywhere proposed in place of the prevailing individualism. This is true of the first French communists, of the fantastic Fourier, of the earnest St. Simon, of Cabet and Blanc, and likewise of the socialistic movement in England which began with Robert Owen.

Lassalle.

Far more immediately connected with the character and force of the social movement in our day is the development of the social democracy in Germany. Ferdinand Lassalle, of Jewish parentage, trained in the speculative school of Hegel and himself a philosophical author, a man of means and of aristocratic habits, professed to be the friend of laborers, became the public advocate of their cause, and by means of fiery eloquence tried to arouse and to unite them for the promotion of their interests. He arrested the attention of scholars and prelates and statesmen, and Bismarck stated publicly that it was a pleasure and a profit to discuss social theories with him. He proposed productive associations of laborers, aided by state capital; but this scheme never led to any practical results. He freely appropriated the social thoughts of others, gave them a popular form, and with an intense, contagious earnestness communicated them to his hearers. It was his special mission to make the laborers aware of their condition so as to feel keenly their needs, to contrast these with the ease and luxury of the rich, to inspire them with the hope of relief, and to unite them in an effort to secure their aim.

Karl Marx.

Lassalle was but a pioneer in the socialistic movement in Germany; he prepared the way for Karl Marx, the real leader of the social democracy. Marx was also of Jewish parentage and a disciple of Hegel. He was what we call brainy, a man of ideas, mercilessly critical, sharply dialectical, learned, but likewise a thinker, a master of facts as well as of logic, uniting the power of induction with that of abstraction and deduction. His work, "Capital," is the bible of the social democracy.

Labor in England.

His part in the social movement can be but briefly summarized; his main doctrines will be considered in a later chapter. His residence in Germany, France, Belgium, and England enabled him to study the condition of the laboring classes in these countries. While living in London, he carefully examined the industrial condition of England; and in connection with his friend Friedrich Engels he brought to light the sufferings of the laboring classes in that country during the first half of this century. In that land, where industrial individualism celebrated its greatest triumphs, an astonishing amount of misery, of injustice, and brutality was revealed, and in spite of all claims to enlightenment and Christianity it became evident that in some respects a heathenism prevailed which was worthy of savages. The wealth was in a few hands; the great mass of the people were hopeless toilers; many of them died prematurely, a large proportion in alms-houses; the hours of labor were excessive, the food was insufficient, and the homes were uncomfortable; often the toilers were worked in gangs, as slaves and criminals are worked; women unfit to labor and needed at home, and children whose place was in school or on the play-ground, were employed in mines or crowded in factories, amid sanitary conditions of the worst character; and the young of both sexes were thrown into

such relations, both by night and by day, as seriously to endanger their morals. The inevitable results were gross ignorance, the multiplication of diseases, and a process of degeneration from generation to generation.

Friedrich Engels.

In the book of Friedrich Engels on "The Condition of the English Working Classes," published in 1845, based on personal investigation and official documents, many of the statements are appalling. In alms-houses the treatment was often such as to justify the names applied to them—bastiles or hells. For a slight offence, if an offence at all, a boy of five was obliged for three nights to sleep on coffin lids in a room for the dead, and on a little girl the same punishment was inflicted. We read of "women made unfit to bear children, children crippled, men debilitated, limbs shattered, whole generations ruined, weakened and infected with disease. . . . And then when one reads of the barbarity in individual instances! How children were brought by the overseers out of bed naked, with the clothes under their arms, driven into the factory with stripes and kicks, how (when in the factory) they were awakened with blows, how in spite of this they fell asleep at their work, how a poor child in its sleep, after the machine was stopped, jumped up at the call of the overseer and, its eyes closed, made with its hands the motions required by its work; when one reads how the children, too weary to go home, hid themselves under the wool in the drying room to sleep there, and could be driven out of the factory only with straps; how many hundreds came home every evening so weary as to be too sleepy to eat their supper; that their parents found them kneeling at their bedside, having fallen asleep during their prayers; when one reads all this and a hundred other infamies and horrors in this one report, all attested on oath and confirmed by several witnesses, stated by men declared

by the commissioners to be worthy of credence . . . should we not then feel outraged and angered at this class (the bourgeoisie) who boast of their humanity and sacrifices, while their sole aim is to fill their purses at any price?"

Labor on the Continent.

This was at the very time when the Social Problem began to agitate large numbers in enlightened lands, laborers in particular. Whilst such horrors might be least expected in England, they were of course not confined to that country. Throughout Europe the laborers were treated as an inferior order of beings, as the servants or slaves of the higher classes. This was almost inevitable where a hereditary nobility introduced a caste system only less rigid than that of India. The nobles had ceased to furnish the soldiers of the country; but they retained the privileges of the feudal ages, while throwing the responsibilities and burdens on the people. The doom which rested on the toilers became intolerable, and was in direct conflict with the ideas of right which possessed them, and with the republican principles which had begun to prevail. The condition prevalent in the first half of the century has changed. In England the factory laws and the sanitary regulations in the interest of laborers have made that land, in many respects, a model for other nations. But before the enactment of those laws and even since, the white slaves of Albion were in such a condition that American abolitionists were said to excite little sympathy for the American slave; the English white slave being regarded as in a worse state. And on the Continent the condition has also changed and is still changing; but these changes are due mainly to the progress made by the social movement and by social agitations.

Theories of Marx.

The exposures by Marx and Engels, and by various English and Continental writers, filled sympathetic minds with grief and shame and indignation, and created an intense desire to ameliorate the condition of the laboring classes. The theories which Marx advanced have been powerful in deepening and broadening the social movement. Proudhon pronounced property theft; Lassalle declared that private property appropriates to one's individual use what is really foreign to him; but Marx developed a new system of political economy which aimed to do away with private productive capital, to change totally the present mode of production and distribution, and to put in place of the existing social fabric an entirely new one. The theory based on Adam Smith, emphasized by Ricardo, and developed by their followers, namely, that labor is the source of all exchange value, was used by Marx as the corner-stone of his economic system. If labor is the sole producer of value, then all the value ought to go to the laborer; that is, the entire product of labor belongs to the laborer. Marx, however, argues that now he does not get the full value of his toil. The capitalist furnishes the raw materials and the tools of labor; and the laborer, instead of the product of his toil, gets only a wage, while the product goes to the capitalist. Marx claims that the wage does not pay the workman fully; his work produces more than he gets for it. He is systematically robbed of a large part of his earnings; this part the capitalist appropriates. The laborer earned it but is robbed of it; the capitalist takes it but did not earn it. Whether appearing in the form of rent, interest, or profit, it is an "unearned increment."

Effect on Laborers.

This theory of the exploitation of laborers served to embitter the toilers, and it is one of the most exciting factors in the labor agitations of the day. Connected with it is another theory, emphasized by Lassalle and known as the iron law of wages, namely, that the conditions of labor, such as the law of demand and supply, and the desire of capitalists to make their profits as large as possible, tend to keep wages down to a level barely sufficient to support the laborer and his offspring, the future laborers. The laborers were convinced that the robbery committed on them, the poor ones, served to keep them poor, while it made the rich richer. This robbery, they were taught by Marx, is not confined to the individual capitalist, but is inherent, as an essential element, in the present system of production. The feeling that they were subject to the greatest outrage has burned with increasing intensity in the hearts of laborers. Whoever considers their convictions and puts himself in their place can understand why the social democrats regard with suspicion all great possessions; why they declare that the excessive concentration of wealth cannot be the product of honest toil and of actual earnings; why the bonds that have heretofore held private property are being loosened; and why its destruction or forcible appropriation by others is in some quarters not deemed a crime. These theories make it evident why labor has come to the front; why laborers are excited and claim to be the producers and only honest owners of all the wealth of the land, and why the doctrine is proclaimed that the cruel exploitation of labor must be met by a revolution which will overthrow the present social system.

The Hope.

To the embitterment of laborers and to the wrath so often manifested in violent outbreaks another important factor was added: the hope that the remedy is within reach. Marx proposed a radical cure: the overthrow of the existing order of things and the establishment of the socialistic state. In this state labor is to be the sole test of values, all men are to be laborers, and the full reward of toil is to go to the toiler. With this paradise of labor before them the laboring classes had a definite aim, and its realization was presented as not only possible but inevitable. This theory of the socialistic state is the hope, the inspiration, and the aim of the social democrats in all lands, and they are the most numerous and most powerful social agitators. Other laborers who do not accept their views are also encouraged to believe that there is some way out of the existing difficulties, and for this reason they combine, enter into conflict with capital, seek political power, and advocate vigorously various measures for relief.

Compared With Former Movements.

These various factors, not isolated, but working co-operatively, together with their accompanying circumstances, need but be weighed in order to learn why the present movement differs so greatly from the social agitations of the past. All through history we find that the slaves and the poorer members of society made efforts to rise into better condition and greater privilege. Class hatred is not new; repeated attempts at revolution have been made by laborers. But laborers with their condition and environment have changed, and therefore the present social movement is peculiar. The introduction of machinery, of the factory system, of invention, and of steam power; the division and co-operation of labor, and the massing of laborers; the separation of the industrial agents into capitalists and laborers, into owners of

the instruments and the products of labor and into wage-earners; the increase of the means of communication and transportation; the growth of the industrial centres; the great concentration of wealth; the development of competition, of individualism, and of political economy; the modern ideas of the personality and of human rights; the education of the masses and their political enfranchisement; the evolution of society and of social science; the weakening of faith; the emphasis on material interests and on pleasure; the character of wealth; the contrast between the ideal of the toilers and their actual situation; the organization and solidarity of laborers; the hope inspired by socialism and other social theories: these are the main factors to be considered in tracing the causes of the existing social movements. Formerly social dreamers appeared at long intervals, with vague theories and fantastic Utopias; now a severe realism prevails, an unreserved exposure of real ills, and an effort at relief based on the actual condition of things. Throughout the past the cry of the oppressed is heard, with the most pathetic appeals for help, but without the conditions to meet their demands; now laborers are no longer isolated as then, but united; they are intelligent and self-conscious; they are determined to help themselves and believe they have the means to do so; they are persistent and resolute, animated by that inspiration which springs from the hope of success. The changes wrought in persons and things are thus the causes of the social agitations and movements of the day, and the creators of our Social Problem.

Literature.

The Social Problem is the product of the age as well as the culmination of historic processes, and it must be studied in the light of the age whose problem it is. In the author's "The Age and the Church," Student Publishing Co., Hartford, Conn.,

the dominant forces and tendencies of our times are considered. The appendix on The Study of the Age, and the chapters on Principles of Investigation, on Characteristics of the Age, and on The Church and Socialism will be found of most value to the student of the Social Problem. On the modern method of production see Arnold Toynbee, "Industrial Revolution in England," Rivingtons, London. R. W. C. Taylor, "The Modern Factory System," Kegan Paul, London. John A. Hobson, "The Evolution of Modern Capitalism. A Study of Machine Production," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. On the intellectual progress and the development of modern ideas the works of Guizot and Buckle on Civilization, of Draper on "The Intellectual Development of Europe," of Rousseau and others who prepared the way for the French revolution, and of Carlyle and other writers on the revolution itself, are valuable. The change of laborers themselves as a factor in producing the Social Problem has not received the attention its importance deserves. For the progress of the English laborer the work of J. E. Thorold Rogers, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages. The History of English Labor," 2 vols., Sonnenschein, London, is indispensable. The condition of the English laborer during the first half of the nineteenth century and the history of English factory legislation have been frequently discussed. Besides the book of Engles mentioned in the text, see Marx, "Capital," Vol. I. On modern socialistic movements, Ely, "French and German Socialism in Modern Times," Harper and Brothers, New York, and the other histories of socialism. On Lassalle, W. H. Dawson, "German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle," Sonnenschein. Rae devotes the fourth chapter to Marx, Laveleye the fourth to Marx and the fifth to Lassalle.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES.

American Optimism.

Respecting our problem a singular optimism prevails in the United States. In the European countries, with their hereditary rank and other relics of the feudal ages, the social agitations seem natural; but it was thought that they could not flourish on American soil. The favors which were showered on the United States made the impression on the citizens that this is the land of destiny and that its prosperous course is assured. Fate becomes a snare when to it is attributed what depends on the virtue and energy of the people. Evils have been hidden or ignored which should have caused alarm. Some have boldly asserted that America has no poor, that it is the promised land for laborers, and that it has no Social Problem. This traditional optimism became too firmly rooted to be disturbed by the periodical labor troubles. A species of infatuation resulted from a contemplation of the marvelous resources of the country which were pronounced inexhaustible; the uninterrupted prosperity of the nation became a dogma, and faith in it the test of American patriotism; the New World was declared to have been hidden so long by providence that just at the right time it might serve as the home of free institutions which God has established and will maintain; labor was affirmed to receive its full reward, the patriotic intelligence of the masses was believed to be a guarantee of future safety, and by some kind of magic it was expected to transform the immigrants, invited from the old despotisms, into

free and devoted American patriots. The same imperturbable optimism was sure that no serious attempt would be made to destroy the Union, and when the attempt was actually made, believed that several thousand men, sent for a few months on a sporting expedition, could easily crush the rebellion. Nothing can be done with men who take a bright vision for reality. A false optimism is more dangerous than anarchism; it palsies the arm which with vigorous efforts might crush the destructive tendencies.

Pessimism.

One danger in this optimism is the tendency to beget the other extreme when it discovers that it has attempted to build without a foundation. When a panic comes, or a financial crisis, or when strikes like those at Pittsburgh, Homestead, and Chicago occur, the optimists are appalled, despair seizes them, and pessimism reigns. Then voices are heard which question the ability of the government to meet the emergency, and men lose faith in the perpetuity of our republican institutions and in the endurance of the existing social system. Many wonder whether a standing army has not become a necessity, and whether a stronger arm than that of a republican government will not be required to prevent the reign of the mob.

Even in calmer periods the reaction against a foolish optimism is felt. In many places gloomy forebodings have taken possession of the people, as if events were pushing inevitably toward some catastrophe. Social specialists and professional men are sharing in an increasing degree these forebodings. Parents tremble for their children, being apprehensive that the culmination may come in their day. A lecturer of extensive observation says: "I believe that we are on the verge of a revolution." A college president, visiting different states, declares that the embitterment of laborers against capital is on the increase, and that he does

not see how a revolution can be avoided. The most serious apprehensions are likewise entertained by capitalists and business men. One must be blind not to behold the ominous forebodings.

The Presidential Campaign.

The lessons of the presidential campaign in 1896 ought to have a lasting effect. It then became evident that discontent is not local but national, that it is deep and energetic and determined. With multitudes the issue was not so much the monetary standard as the antagonism to the growing dominance of capitalism and trusts. Over six million votes were cast for the candidate who appealed to the masses against the classes, and the change of 25,000 votes in a few states would have secured his election. The most strenuous efforts were made by both parties to get the votes of laborers, every one realizing that on them the result depended. They have entered politics as a distinct force and will remain there as such; they know that they have the majority and need but unite to control the nation. Those who belong to the defeated party have been made more determined by their defeat, and we have reason to expect more vigilance, greater resoluteness, and more effective co-operation for the attainment of their end in the future. We may deprecate all appeal to class prejudice and sectional interest in a time of frantic national excitement; but the greater wisdom is with those who strive to discover the reason of the discontent and to remove the causes of revolution.

Foreign Specialists.

Facts like these and contact with people in various states have convinced the writer that the stronger reason is with pessimism, and that it is rapidly banishing optimism. But the truth lies between the two extremes. Every student of the age knows that peculiar dangers are connected with the social

movement in the United States. The majority of the citizens are not yet prepared to believe that the danger is so great and imminent as the actuality warrants; but there is no ground for despair. No doubt the threatening evils can be overcome by earnest study and prompt action. An awakening of the most hopeful character, but limited in extent, has occurred; and as the danger becomes apparent to them, all earnest men will strive to avert it.

Europeans have expressed surprise at the indifference and ignorance of Americans respecting the Social Problem. The interest of European students in our social movements and agitations is significant. Foreign specialists, free from our prejudices, think our industrial development likely to receive serious checks and to be subject to great changes. Some of them, as von Studnitz and von Waltershausen, have carefully studied our problem and embodied the results in valuable works. While we boasted that such a problem did not exist, these specialists came to our country, tried to fathom the full meaning of the problem and to discover the goal of our social tendencies. They saw in our evolution the same process with which they had become familiar at home; but they also discovered that the movement in Europe has advanced farther than in the United States. The movement began in the latter country later; it is, however, well known that the tendencies here are apt to be more vigorous and more rapid than in Europe. While we paid little attention to a problem which seemed three thousand miles distant, these specialists discovered international elements in our social agitations. American specialists, few in number, agree with those in Europe that the problem in the United States has elements of peculiar interest and worthy of profound inquiry. The Chicago strike particularly excited deep interest abroad, and the foreign students of our country wondered whether

first of all in the United States the most determined efforts would not be made to solve the Social Problem.

Peculiarities in the United States.

The social condition in the United States explains the fact that here the social question did not so soon arise and assume such vast proportions as in European countries. Influences which spread like an epidemic throughout the Continent and England could not so readily carry their contagion across the Atlantic. Some of our labor troubles are not indigenous; their source is found in immigrants who come from the European agitations. The revolutionary and anarchical tendencies are specially prevalent among foreigners. Most of the social democrats are from continental Europe. Owing to the difference in the conditions, socialism does not have the same meaning here as across the Atlantic. When we take into account the chief factors which enter into the peculiarities of the social movement in the United States, we find that they are due chiefly to the nature of our territory and of our agricultural and industrial pursuits, to the history of our country, to our republican institutions, and to the character of our wealth, of our American laborers, and of our foreign population.

A Foreign Problem.

In the United States more than in any other country the social is a foreign problem. For a long time immigration was encouraged in order to meet the great demand for laborers and to settle our valleys and prairies. Since 1840 it has, however, so overwhelmed this country with foreigners as to cause alarm. America became the estuary into which the old countries poured their surplus population. The surplus consisted mainly of laborers, though it also contained other elements. This land became the Botany Bay of the world. Unscrupulous adventurers came, villians who tried to cheat justice at home, men banished because intolerable, and

those who "hated good for good's sake" and fled for their country's good. It was a common saying on the Continent when a criminal escaped, "He has gone to America." These were, however, the exception; usually the immigrants consisted of such toilers as hoped to exchange their Egyptian bondage for a land that flows with milk and honey. Many were ignorant, often they mistook liberty for license; some never master our language and never become imbued with the spirit of American institutions. The most ignorant and most degraded are not socialistic or anarchistic leaders; perhaps they have no conception of theoretical socialism and anarchism. They form a stolid mass who can hardly be aroused to consider their own true interests, who concern themselves little about laborers as a class and about progress, whom it is difficult to organize, and who become a disturbing element to any organization they enter. They form one of the greatest barriers in the way of aspiring and progressive laborers. But when once aroused, they are so much brute force under the sway of passion. In strikes or crises or revolution, they must be reckoned with as dangerous elements. But they are by no means the majority of the foreigners. Many citizens of foreign birth must be classed with the native born who are devotedly attached to American institutions, prizing them all the more highly because in such glaring contrast with those they left behind. In the war for the Union large numbers fought bravely for the cause of liberty.

It is, however, chiefly as laborers we here consider our immigrants. Their enforced sacrifice at home, their low standard of living, and their rigid economy enabled them to underbid the American workman. Thus there was not only a conflict between capitalists and laborers, but also a sharp one between laborers. Among native Americans the Caucasian competes with the African; and the Ameri-

can competes with the German, the Scandinavian, the Irish, the Italian, the French, the Hungarian, the Bohemian, the Russian, the Pole, and the Chinese. Will India send its pariah to compete with the Chinaman? Many come with no intention of becoming American citizens, but simply to earn money and take it with them out of the country. Some work under the padrone system, a degradation of labor and a new species of slavery. Not only do these various causes affect wages, but they also result in combinations and conflicts of races. We have foreign cities in our great centres of population, and labor organizations are divided by nationality and speech. These foreign elements greatly complicate our problem. As if by a natural law, these nationalities push each other out of the way, and in some instances they shove the American away and drive him from the field. In New England the Yankee yields to the Celt and Canadian, and manufacturing cities where once we looked for typical Americanism have largely become centres of foreign population.

We are familiar with the theory that the introduction of cheap labor with a low standard of living pushes the intelligent and skilled laborer higher; but we also know that this works much better in theory than in practice. The cause of labor can never be advanced by having a large mass of ignorant and degraded workmen at the bottom. If there are too many laborers for the lowest kind of work, they will tend to press each other down and to pauperize one another. To a certain extent the foreigner may relieve the American laborer of the least desirable work and give him the occasion to devote himself to labor requiring the highest skill; but we cannot disguise the fact that disastrous results will follow if one thousand men compete for skilled labor while only nine hundred are required.

American Laborers.

The process of amalgamation and Americanization was comparatively easy so long as but few foreigners came. Even now, though they remain foreigners in some respects and make their foreign views contagious, they gradually undergo transformation; those who become citizens of the United States acquire the American spirit of freedom, of ambition, and also of extravagance. As their demands grow and fail of realization, they easily pass from content to discontent and disturbances. They become Americanized, but it may take a second or third generation to inculcate fully the American spirit. This spirit we find in the American laborer. He bears the marks of the free institutions amid which he was reared, is conscious of his manhood, glories in political equality with the mightiest in the land, and his erect attitude and manly bearing reveal the dignity of independence. For his person, his family, his home and his table he makes demands which surpass those of the laborers of any European country. The meals of many an American laborer are better than the average of the middle classes of continental Europe. The abundance of work in the past, the high wages, the national resources in which he saw his own opportunities, have made him easy, if not careless, with respect to a livelihood. What other nations call thrift and economy is apt to look like meanness to him. Ever aspiring to raise his standard of living, he deserves encouragement in all legitimate expenses which promote culture and rational enjoyment. We must not forget that an economy which means degradation is false, and that it may be as bad as extravagance. No friend of laborers will begrudge them the best livelihood, whatever it may cost. With his enterprise and energy, the American laborer justly cherishes a high ideal of life; and the coun-

try for which he fought so patriotically in the civil war can afford to promote his best aspirations.

There are dangerous undercurrents among the native as well as foreign laborers. While we look at the bright side we cannot afford to hide the dark side. Taking the foreign and the native press and meetings of laborers, we find as gross materialism, as absolute atheism, and as radical destructiveness, as can be found in the extremest anarchism and nihilism in the Old World. The denunciation of the existing order (or disorder) of things in the United States is limited only by the power of language and the ability of agitators to use it effectively.

Conditions a Century Ago.

Many are inclined to overestimate the advantages of laborers at the birth of the republic, and to minimize the progress they have made since. Comparing their condition at that time with the present, Professor McMaster says: "There can, however, be no doubt that a wonderful amelioration has taken place since that day in the condition of the poor. Their houses were meaner, their food was coarser, their clothing was of commoner stuff, their wages were, despite the depreciation that has gone on in the value of money, lower by one-half than at present. A man who performed what would now be called unskilled labor . . . usually received as the fruit of his daily toil two shillings." * Sometimes when laborers were scarce a six-pence was added. This was in 1784; ten years earlier the wage was only half as high. In New York City it was much higher about ten years later. Servants then received eight dollars a month, footmen ten, hatters two dollars a day, carpenters tenpence an hour, common sailors could hardly be had for twenty-four dollars a month. At the beginning

* "History of the People of the United States," I., 96.

of our century the pay was generally low. "On the Pennsylvania canals the diggers ate the coarsest diet, were housed in the rudest sheds, and paid six dollars a month from May to November, and five dollars a month from November to May. Hod-carriers and mortar-mixers, diggers and choppers, who, from 1793 to 1800, labored on the public buildings and cut the streets and avenues of Washington City, received seventy dollars a year." * In the first decade of this century, as the population increased and improvements were rapidly made, unskilled laborers received as high as a dollar to a dollar and a third a day.

In 1784 the home and table of the laborer were far below the present average. "In the low and dingy rooms which he called his home were wanting many articles of adornment and of use now to be found in the dwellings of the poorest of his class. Sand sprinkled on the floor did duty as a carpet. There was no glass on his table, there was no china in his cupboard, there were no prints on his wall. What a stove was he did not know, coal he had never seen, matches he had never heard of. . . He rarely tasted fresh meat, and paid for it a much higher price than his posterity. Everything, indeed, which ranked as a staple of life was very costly. Corn stood at three shillings the bushel, wheat at eight and six pence, . . . a pound of salt pork was tenpence. Many other commodities now to be seen on the tables of the poor were either quite unknown, or far beyond the reach of his scanty means." †

With the growth of the country the conveniences and advantages increased and the laborer shared them. The civilization at the close of the revolutionary war was very different from the present; there has been humane development. At that time men were imprisoned for debt.

* "History of the People of the United States," II., 617.

† I., 96.

"One hundred years ago the laborer who fell from a scaffold or lay sick of a fever was sure to be seized by the sheriff the moment he recovered, and be carried to jail for the bill of a few dollars which had been run up during his illness." * The jails were horrible and the treatment of criminals was brutal. We must remember, too, that the war for independence did not introduce universal liberty and equality. As there were masters and slaves, so there were lords and servants; we read of "well-bred" people in distinction from the masses, showing that European distinctions still prevailed. A property test existed as the condition for voting and holding office, so that the laborer was virtually excluded from these privileges.

Marvelous as has been the advance of laborers since the close of the revolution, this does not settle the question whether it is as great as it ought to be, and whether it has kept pace with the general development of the country. Some of the changes since the beginning of this century have been detrimental to him, and the contrast of his position with the great and rapid accumulation of wealth makes him painfully conscious of his deprivations.

Changes in Labor.

The opportunities afforded by the wonderful growth of the United States gave labor many advantages during the early history of the republic. That it had, however, abundant reason for discontent at the beginning of that history has been indicated, and throughout this century we find laborers complaining of their treatment, and struggling to rise into better condition. They wanted more of the freedom and equality which they believed involved in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, and in the revolutionary war. Strikes date back as far as the colonial

* "History of the People of the United States," I., 98.

period in last century; and all along we hear that laborers complain of their subordination, they agitated for less work and more pay, and looked with ill will on the increasing distance between themselves and the rich. Many evils long complained of have been aggravated in recent times, particularly since the civil war. Has the laborer received a full proportion of the advantages of the wonderful development of machinery? The official answer in the First Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Labor is, "No." It is there stated that he has "not yet received an equitable share of the results growing out of the free introduction of power machinery." In another place the same Commissioner says: "If the question be asked, Has the wage-earner received his just and equitable share of the economic benefits derived from the introduction of machinery? the answer must be, No. By this is meant his relative share, compared with that going to capital. In the struggle for supremacy in the great countries devoted to mechanical production it probably has been impossible for him to share equitably in such benefits." *

Before the overwhelming tide of immigration set in the opportunities for the American laborer to rise were favorable, work was abundant and laborers were scarce; now the reverse is often the case. New business enterprises offering him a chance to rise do not spring up now as in some periods of the past, and the amount of capital required to enter business is greater than when the industries were conducted on a smaller scale. There has been a growing tendency to assimilate American conditions to those prevalent in Europe. European laborers are beginning to question whether the workingmen of the United States are much better off than themselves. There are Americans who

* "The Industrial Evolution of the United States," 341.

declare that in some respects the conditions in England are more favorable than ours. "The American aristocracy is more powerful and more dangerous than the English. Our class system is not less cruel for having its boundaries less clearly marked. And it can no longer be granted that workingmen are better off in the United States than in England. The coal miners in the North of England have strong trade unions, work eight hours or less per day, support their co-operative stores, and in some places are organizing University Extension centres. The coal miners of western Pennsylvania, already low enough, are being forced lower by the competition of the latest Continental immigrants with their unspeakably degraded standard of life. As to the crowded populations of cities, we are beginning to see that the problem of lower New York is in some respects even more serious than the problem of East London." *

We must also consider that other lands have entered into competition with the United States in agricultural products, for which the European countries have furnished so valuable a market to our farmers. These changes are largely due to the increased facilities for transportation by land and water. Regions in various countries have been opened by means of railroads to the world's commerce which were heretofore inaccessible; and the trade of Europe has been greatly affected by the opening of the Suez Canal. Russia, the Balkan States, India, Australia, and South America dispute our supremacy in the grain and meat market; and the European nations will seek to become still more independent of us through their colonies in Africa. Our industries have made such rapid strides

* This is the result of a study of American and English laborers by Mr. R. A. Woods, of the Andover House, Boston, "English Social Movements," preface.

that we have grown more and more into an industrial people. We are canvassing the world as a market for our manufactures. We have had a monopoly of certain agricultural implements; but this is ended by the manufacture of the same in Europe.

Other Changes.

The competition of laborers in the United States with one another and with those in Europe and India tends to depress wages. Other factors of a depressing nature also affect the American workmen. They are convinced that the resources and opportunities, formerly thought to be eternal, are growing more scarce. The land that is best and most accessible to the market is gone, being occupied by actual settlers or having passed into the possession of speculators or great corporations and of foreign syndicates. Land which could formerly be had by the laborer for the taking, is now beyond his reach. The same official report quoted above states "that three-fifths of the public domain has been exhausted or taken up, either by actual settlers or by grants to corporations, but to a very large extent by the latter, and that the remaining two-fifths is made up largely of undesirable land." For a long time this republic, compared with the rest of the world, was truly the paradise of laborers. The greatest advantages were offered to energy and skill, and numerous toilers worked their way into wealth and positions of prominence. In the Northern States, at any rate, it was taken for granted that a man worked hard even if a capitalist; the social contrasts were not so marked but that a certain degree of equality in toil prevailed. But for decades wealth has rapidly accumulated and concentrated; the number of those who can live from rent, profit, and interest has greatly increased; there has been a growing separation between capitalism and labor; luxury developed so as to make the contrast between the

homes and lives of the various classes more striking; and wealth with its dominion has in many cases passed into hands that did not earn but inherited it. Thus the social distinctions have been more sharply defined and class interests intensified. It has become painfully evident that men do not start alike in the race of life, their opportunities are not equal, some are fettered to toil, while others can live without work; and by a natural economic process the man who has a twofold advantage at the start may increase it an hundredfold and drive his competitor to the wall. Much of course depends on the use made of the opportunities offered; but it is clear that to many thousands from childhood the advantages are limited in education and in the industries, and severe toil seems the only possible lot.

Another process is watched by laborers with apprehension: everywhere the minerals, the industries, the traffic, and the means of transportation are being monopolized. The transformation thus wrought has arrested the attention of foreigners and makes itself powerfully felt at home. As a hundred years ago the owner of machinery took the trade from the hand-laborer and made him an employee in the factory, so now the small factory is swallowed by the large one, the independent manufacturer is crushed by trusts, the trade of the little store is absorbed by the large establishments, and it remains yet to be seen whether the development of modern monopolization will not produce almost as marked a change in competition as that which took place at the introduction of machinery. Whether their fears are well founded or not, laborers are apprehensive that the concentration of wealth and the growth of monopolies will endanger the existence of the middle class, the very class to which they aspire to rise; if that disappears their own fate becomes the more hopeless, nothing but perpetual toil being left apparently for them and their families. What-

ever economists may say, and whatever the facts may be, many of the American workingmen are convinced that the rich are growing richer, the poor poorer, and that the doom of the latter is becoming more inevitable.

Character of Wealth.

America is the land of contrasts, not only between the different classes but also in the same class. Among men of wealth they are striking. Some of the rich who rose from the ranks of labor have retained a warm heart for the toilers, treat them with humanity, and are themselves energetic workers. One must have an extremely limited experience not to know of American capitalists who are to be classed among the truest friends of laborers. With the bitterness now excited against the possessing classes, some forget what the creators and captains of the industries have done for the prosperity of the country, the workingmen included. Men of ability and energy have organized great industries, developed the wealth of the nation, and provided work for many thousand laborers. Their anxieties, their sacrifices, their risks, their toil, have certainly not been less than those of the hardest workmen. When a crisis comes, thousands of capitalists and employers are in the severest straits, and some of them do not hesitate to make personal sacrifices to keep the laborers dependent on them employed. Surely such men deserve more than a sneer or opprobrium because they are capitalists. The creators of wealth, which without them would not even exist, deserve a share, and a large share, of the wealth they create. The industries they organize might not exist without them or might fall into chaos.

Besides these eminent industrial benefactors, the world has looked with admiration on the rich who gave magnificently to churches, to schools, and to benevolent institutions. The examples are too striking for any one to ques-

tion that much of the wealth of the United States is in generous hands which are controlled by noble hearts. Every city has men and women of means who are anxious to relieve the needy and to help the struggling ones. While laborers sometimes treat one another brutally, these benefactors always meet them with the spirit of sympathy and love and helpfulness. And whenever labor incribes on its banner "Justice and Humanity," these men and women will be its warmest advocates and firmest supporters. Who can question that when once the issue is fairly presented and the people are educated to appreciate its importance, the nation which gave its blood and its treasure to free the black slave, will also remove any slavery that still adheres to labor?

Amid the envy, the jealousy, the prejudice and partisanship of the day these things require special emphasis. But there is another side. Sometimes the gifts which the world applauds lose their grandeur through the suspicion that the money was stolen from labor, from competing firms, from municipalities, from the state, or from the nation. If the money which belongs to laborers is to be devoted to charity, they naturally prefer to give it themselves. Wealth may be acquired legally, and yet the question remains whether the laws are just and the conditions right which make the acquisition possible. Some conspicuous examples create the impression that thieves and robbers are too common among the accumulators of vast fortunes. The old nations think covetousness our besetting sin and dominant passion; it is unquestionably sadly prominent. We can furnish many illustrations that Dante is right in making fleshly lust, pride, and avarice the cardinal sins. This avarice kisses the earth; and with its face turned downward, it cannot see the heavens. It makes the soul itself sordid and the ideals, like the pursuits, earthly.

The English language is not strong enough to depict in true colors this passion for gold. Dante properly consigns it to the torments of *Purgatorio* and *Inferno.*

This passion is among the most degrading and most despicable features of American life. Nowhere else has capitalism the same power as in the United States, and nowhere else is it equally effective in dragging all interests of society to its materialistic level, and in corrupting the public conscience and the public life. When J. S. Mill says, " Great landowners are everywhere an idle class," we do not feel that the statement especially concerns the United States; but when Schæffle, the eminent sociologist, declares that nothing is more brutal than a moneyed aristocracy in persecuting those who dispute its dominion, we can furnish the proof. The plutocratic and sybaritic American aristocracy has been described as more contemptible than the European aristocracy; but whoever has witnessed its insolence at home and its folly abroad knows that much of it is so greatly despised as to be beneath contempt. We have a parvenu class which is ignorant and stupid, but haughty, hard, and mean. Europe has an aristocracy whose glory is under ground; we have a sprouting aristocracy whose glory is neither above nor under ground. It consists of boors and snobs and fools; it needs no exposure, to that it attends grandly itself. Laborers and scholars would be more tolerant of its insolent bearing if the friction of centuries had polished some of the sharp edges, or if a rough diamond could be discovered in the common pebble. What arouses the indignation of men of sense is the fact that these simpletons parade their ignorant and vulgar display before other nations as typical of Americans, become the laughing stock of guides and porters and waiters, and leave the impression that we are a people of silly upstarts, with much money but no brains. Fortunately,

some of this stuff emigrates, attracted abroad permanently by titles, by uniforms, by the society of impecunious hereditary rank, by court circles; naturally a republic is not congenial to them. Perhaps the time is not distant when the nation will spew the vile thing out of its mouth.

The Social Problem in the United States is largely a question of wealth, of the selfishness of its owners, of the debasing pleasures to which it ministers, of its corruptions in business and in political life. Capitalism has come to mean dominion, and in many instances its dominion is such that multitudes query whether its despotism and injustice can be destroyed without the destruction of capitalism itself. Many laborers no longer regard it as a question.

Intimations are made that the church and preachers and politicians and newspapers dare not tell the truth about that ignorant and insolent parvenu who apes the worst features of an effete mediæval aristocracy in the midst of American free institutions. However despicable he may be personally, the magic wand of his wealth is potent. That wealth, no matter how acquired, is deemed by himself the summit of all excellence. Its glory is conferred on its possessor, and he thinks himself fit to be the arbiter of religion and morality, and to look with pity on an education which does not minister directly to wealth. The rich materialism of the United States threatens to crush, not only the idealism, but also the profound scholarship of the nation. What is the thinker beside the genius who turns his base motives into gold, and what is the devoted and efficient schoolteacher beside the ignorant and worthless lady of fashion? Men who come from the midst of the European aristocracies to study our situation are astounded at the character of much of our capitalism. Bryce says: "The capitalist

class consists of large merchants, manufacturers, bankers, and railroad men, with a few great land speculators and directors of trading or carrying companies. How much capacity and energy, how much wealth and influence there is in this small class everybody knows. It includes the best executive ability of the country, and far more ability than is devoted to the public service of the state. . . . Their (political) interest lies chiefly in using politics for their own purposes. . . . Their practical talent does not necessarily imply political insight, any more than moral elevation, nor have they generally the taste or leisure to think seriously about the needs of the state. In no country does one find so many men of eminent capacity for business, shrewd, forcible, and daring, who are so uninteresting, so intellectually barren, outside the sphere of their business knowledge."

Time will no doubt separate the worthy and aspiring capitalists more and more from the worthless ones. The latter must be hurled from their power, or their contagion will corrupt the nation in the future as in the past. The public is beginning to estimate them at their true worth. Here we are concerned chiefly with their influence on laborers. These cannot but regard this mammonism as the bane of politics, of education, of morals, and of society. It is wealth of this character which arouses the antipathy and hatred of the American laborer who has been trained to independence, has cherished republican notions of equality, and has learned to measure responsibility by privilege. Our republican principles make labor honorable; but a degenerate aristocracy puts a stigma on labor, forms exclusive circles for the cultivation of the spirit of the feudal ages, and affects the social life of America with the very characteristics which produced the French revolution.

Legal Protection of Labor.

It has been the boast that in England and the United States the industries have been most free from governmental control and have had fullest opportunity for unhindered competition. The theory prevailed that the laws are to protect, but in no sense to control, business; in the exercise of his freedom each man is to be unrestrained so long as he does not interfere with the same freedom of others. It was thoughtlessly postulated that all have equal freedom; even a superficial inquiry would have proved the postulate a fiction. Wisdom, skill, and energy were supposed to be the arbiters of fortune in a competition perfectly free. These desirable qualities were indeed developed in a marvelous degree by throwing men on their own resources. But were men really put on an equal footing? "Much is said of the freedom of contract; that the workman has the same power to make contracts for his labor as the merchant has for the sale of his goods. This idea is purely fallacious, for the merchant need not sell his goods to-day, while the workman must his labor, and he is, as a rule, at the mercy of the purchaser instead of being free to keep his labor if he cannot get his price." So says the official report already quoted repeatedly. This fallacious freedom of contract is advocated in the name of laborers because they are best able to look after their own interests.

There is also a beautiful theory which proclaims that by promoting his own interest an individual will likewise promote that of society, a theory which has been made a strong argument in favor of individualism and of selfishness, and which has led its advocates to say "Hands off," whenever government proposed to legislate for the establishment of justice in industrial arrangements. It is a notorious fact that many a man is mistaken respecting his own interests; and still more evident is it that what he

pursues for selfish ends may be in direct conflict with the interests of society. Experience has demonstrated that competition serves to develop evil qualities as energetically as the good. Besides the advantage it affords sagacity, it gives free play to unscrupulous cunning and base shrewdness. Might became the law of right, greed and selfishness were allied with knavery, the strong oppressed the weak; and while honesty might be the best policy, many preferred an egotism which does not trouble itself about honesty. It was demonstrated in both countries that the best opportunities for oppression and fraud are afforded by unrestrained competition to such as are determined to get rich at any cost. The beautiful theory that self-interest means the public good proved a mockery. Self-interest was taken to mean selfishness, and it did not hesitate to enslave the poor and to degrade labor. The horrors produced by individualism in England made it necessary for the law to interfere in behalf of the laboring classes. When the factory laws and inspectors for their enforcement were proposed, the cry was raised that they would rob the industries of freedom and individuals of their rights, and ruin business; but they have proved a blessing to laborers, to the industries, and to the nation.

With the exception of New England and a few other states, the United States has done less for the legal protection of laborers. So long as work was abundant they could choose their labor and employer, could stipulate their terms and in the main protect themselves. These conditions established even among them the tradition that free competition offers them special advantages in selling their labor. But changes since the civil war, the influx of foreigners, and various business depressions have affected their general condition. The crises of 1873 and 1893 revealed the fact that laborers were not as well off as was supposed; for

many thousands to be thrown out of employment meant to be breadless, and strong men anxious to work were obliged to be idle and were reduced to beggary. The demand for laborers had made them dear; now the demand for work made them cheap. The desperation to which they were driven manifested itself in numerous strikes. Anarchy of the worst form became the law of the industries. There being no other law to direct them, capitalists and laborers make their own laws, and execute them their own way. The consequence is that for the dominance of anarchy in industrial pursuits the United States bears the palm among civilized nations. "Each man for himself," was the motto. With the aim to make the profits as large as possible, capital naturally sought to reduce the wage to the utmost; but the laborers naturally sought the highest pay for their work. The competition among themselves was too great to accomplish this singly; so they combined and formed labor unions, in order to act as a unit and the better to wage war with capital. If self-interest is to be the law, without a law of the land to harmonize the different interests and to establish the reign of justice, then labor must take care of its own interest as best it can. The result is a growing antagonism between capitalists and laborers, a frequent appeal to the arbitrament of force, and the determination of each party to yield only to necessity. The logic of all this is—self-help where the state refuses to help, anarchy, violence, revolution.

Change in Legislation.

Von Studnitz, who came to this country from Germany two decades ago in order to study the condition of labor, says: "The legislative enactments in the United States with respect to labor are more recent and less developed than those of any other enlightened land with extensive industries." The general government has done

but little in this direction, with the exception of fixing eight hours as the maximum of a day's work for its employees. So far as the state laws are concerned, we find that Massachusetts has done most to gather labor statistics and to protect the laboring classes. In Europe these statistics are frequently referred to as among the best to be found anywhere. Other states have also tried to fix the maximum hours of labor and to protect the interests of laborers; but in some hardly more than a beginning has been made. The most has been done to regulate the labor of children; some attention has also been paid to legal enactments respecting woman's work, men, as a rule, being treated as if able to protect their own interests. In some of the states the whole subject of labor is left to capitalists and laborers to arrange and fight out as best they can. But the disastrous results of past neglect in this respect are making the demands for a change in the legislative policy of the nation and the states urgent. The conviction is becoming general that the safety of the country, as well as the welfare of society, requires a legal determination of many things which have heretofore been left to take care of themselves. Instead of abstract and theoretical politics, there is now an imperative demand for legislation which is concerned directly with the actual social condition, and seeks to relieve suffering and to remove the existing antagonism. Such demands are now made on legislation that some think there is danger of expecting from it what can be accomplished only by individual effort or by organizations. The main question now is what the functions of the law are in the matter and just what laws are required. Much time and study and experience will be necessary before it can be determined what laws are best; but when this has been discovered, there is no likelihood that any let-alone theory of government will prevent their enactment.

Legislative Needs.

A strong point will be gained when the demands of labor and attention to the social condition are made objects of supreme concern on the part of legislators. This must lead to such inquiries as will develop the needed knowledge for social legislation. The actual needs already recognized are great and numerous, and further study will reveal still more. A complete organization of the industries of the whole land is needed, so that a conscious and organized system may take the place of the prevalent chance and anarchy. Not only must the agricultural, mining, manufacturing, transporting business and commercial interests be treated as an indivisible totality, but also as an integral part of the national organism of thought and life. First of all we need a full consciousness of our economic interests, as the condition for gaining a proper control of them. The government exists for the prosperity of the land; on this prosperity its revenues and its very continuance depend. If it fails to minister to this its inevitable doom is destruction. But it can only do this if it has the proper knowledge. An Industrial Bureau is needed, so completely organized as to have in every state a co-operative branch, with a supervision of the total business of the country, with the most perfect statistics of national and international demand and supply, of the products of agriculture, of mines, of industries, of trade, of commerce, of capital and labor, of the absolute and proportionate increase of each economic factor, of the demand and supply of laborers, of wages, of cost of living, and similar subjects, not for partisan or political purposes, but for social ends, to promote directly the welfare of the people. We have not now the knowledge of the demand and supply of production in order to prevent financial crises, but we ought to have. It should be known what the needs of other lands are, what is

done to meet them, what markets of the world are opening to commerce, and how we can enter them to best advantage. Much of the work required belongs to the various states, the rest is national and international; but with proper organization it can either be accomplished now or the way to do it can be learned. Such a system is the first requirement as the basis on which to determine what laws shall be enacted.

From a consciousness of the actual need the remedy must come. Thus the relation of capital to labor, and of the employer to the employed, must be determined. The dominion of wealth ought not to mean despotism, and labor nominally free should not be slave labor. The weak must be protected; this is now admitted by all ethical nations as among the chief functions of government. That justice which men cannot secure for themselves the law is to establish. Many questions are still matters of inquiry, not being ready for dogmatic decision. The right to existence involves the right to the means of existence; but who is to furnish these means? Does the responsibility rest with those who brought the human being into existence, or on the individual himself, or on society which did not create him and may not want him? Here again we have the problem of the right to employment, the question whether a municipality, a state, or a nation is bound to furnish employment to all who seek and need it. So it must be determined by law at what age and under what conditions children shall be employed; the employment of women must be regulated; laws are required respecting labor on Sunday, at night, and the limit of time during a day or week; so laws for mines and factories are needed to secure the best sanitary and moral regulations, and inspectors are required to see that the laws are enforced. It must also be determined what combinations of capital and labor

shall be allowed, and what their relation to each other shall be. If their relation is merely a question of force, revolution may become inevitable. Many other things will be found to be just and expedient for which we are not yet prepared. Individual initiative and enterprise are not to be hindered, but fostered and properly directed. One of the most important matters is left for future development, namely, what can be done by legislation to secure to labor its full share of the national wealth. These and the other legal enactments required do not mean the enslavement of the industries by law, but to help them, to do what the individuals cannot do, but which they require in order to make their personal efforts most effective and to harmonize the interests which are now conflicting. For the proper and most prosperous organization of industries the United States ought to be the leader of the enlightened nations, instead of lagging in the rear.

Some of the demands here made are already met admirably by our National and State Bureaux of Labor. For Bureaux of this character the United States bears the palm. The oldest on record is that of Massachusetts. Besides the National Bureau, over twenty states have Labor Bureaux. The national one, under the efficient management of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, has published valuable general and special reports. Thus far the work has been chiefly statistical. It is a great advantage of the United States that it has a permanent bureau, while other nations appoint temporary commissions to inquire into matters pertaining to labor. The report of the English Commission is, however, more voluminous than all the reports of our national bureau, and is rich in valuable material. The national and state bureaux in the United States are of recent origin, and their past work is that of a pioneer who prepares the way for greater enterprises. The present position of the national

bureau is somewhat anomalous; it is hard to fix its exact place in the organism of the government, particularly its relation to the treasury and the interior departments. Its work is largely that of the census commission, and with proper co-operation it seems that an advantage might be gained in the efficiency and economy of its work. Strangely enough there is no official and organic connection between the national and the state bureaux, the difficulty being apparently a dread of interference with state rights. Heretofore the appropriations have been insufficient for the important investigations required. The office of the Commissioner is important enough for a cabinet minister or secretary, but that would make it political and liable to change with the administrations. The excellent service already rendered by the national bureau will lead the students of our problem to look to it more and more for statistics and for guidance in their researches.

As England with its Bank of England and the other institutions on Lombard Street now does the banking of the world, and as the favorable position of that country has made it the world's industrial and commercial centre, do not our position and power make the United States the natural monetary, agricultural, and commercial centre for the western hemisphere, and in a measure also between Europe and the Orient? However this may be, and however long the commerce which ought to be in our hands is negligently left to other nations, our condition requires the most perfect national and international statistics, and the most complete knowledge of the world's industries and markets, in such a form as will make them accessible to business men and laborers, as well as to specialists. By the development of the national bureau these needs can be better supplied than is now done by any nation.

Diplomatic and Consular Service.

The nations of continental Europe are so intimately related that each is obliged to study and respect the views and tendencies of the others. Germany, for instance, is extremely sensitive to the opinions of the press, and to the political and military movements, in Russia, France, and England. But the United States is so supreme in the western hemisphere that the people do not cultivate the same sensitiveness respecting their own neighbors and European views. One of our loudest boasts is our independence of foreign nations. The haughty tone of our press and Congress in this respect is severely commented on in Europe. We are charged with arrogance, with superciliousness, with extreme selfishness, and with an inordinate greed which is intent on exploiting other nations in order to enrich ourselves. The scandals connected with our elections and legislatures, the impotence of law and the abuse of authority, the rottenness of municipal governments, the anarchy revealed in lynching and countless forms of violence, and the total mass of corruption displayed before the world and perhaps magnified by our journals, have produced deep disgust abroad, and are used most effectively to support the old despotisms and to prevent the progress of republicanism. The liberals on the Continent are naturally expected to be the friends of our institutions; but our conditions have so appalled them that among them, as well as in the ranks of the conservatives, our severest critics are found. This feeling of contempt and disgust is deeply affecting our commercial relations. All classes, particularly the ruling powers, turn from the peoples they distrust and dislike, to those whose feelings are friendly, and with the latter seek to establish the most advantageous commercial relations. What is here stated is the result of long study abroad, and personal observation

convinced the author that our foreign trade will suffer seriously and permanently, unless our relations to foreign powers become more friendly and a more favorable impression prevails abroad with respect to our national character. We are supposed to isolate ourselves unless selfish advantages can be gained otherwise; and other nations will be inclined to promote this isolation in order to show us that they can get grain and meat and industrial products from other lands, and can be as independent of us as we of them.

Whoever is conversant with the facts knows that our diplomatic and consular service in many respects helps to increase the unfavorable impression respecting the United States. The chief blame rests on the system. Many men sent abroad to represent us are an honor to the nation. Indeed, this may be said to be generally the character of our foreign ministers and consuls. But others disgrace us; they can fill a low niche in party politics, and even if it is very low they need not stoop; but they are not fit to send abroad. Even capable men are, however, embarrassed when put into important diplomatic positions for which they have had neither training nor experience. The probability is that they are as ignorant of the language as of the etiquette of the court to which they are sent. We need not dwell on the mortification that follows, but even for independent Americans it is not agreeable to be made ridiculous. Four years are hardly enough to master a foreign language, to become familiar with the history and condition of the foreign country, to develop into an experienced and efficient minister or consul, to represent our country most ably, and to send to Washington the most valuable information. It is enough to disgrace this foreign service to make it the reward of political service, especially where politics is thought to consort with corruption; but what

shall be said of a system that removes the ministers and consuls when barely introduced into their work, in order to make way for others who have no experience and must themselves step out so soon as they have made themselves useful to their country? We must remember that these men are called to associate and compete with other representatives who have been most carefully trained for their work and devote their lives to their calling.

Our foreign relations are so important that the system now followed ought to be revised. In justice to the good men sent abroad this is needed; it is necessary in order that the immigration to our shores may be better controlled; it is demanded by our agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests; and it is required by the honor and influence of our beloved land.

Condition of Laborers.

It is a sad feature of the situation that outside of the laboring classes but little is known of the thoughts that disturb their minds and the passions that burn in their hearts. When prelates and scholars and capitalists imagine the chronic discontent of the present due to demagogues or a few disappointed and inefficient and indolent laborers, they cherish a fatal delusion. Not less unfortunate is the ignorance prevalent among the other classes respecting the actual condition of the laboring masses. Many of the wealthier and middle classes take it for granted, without taking the trouble to make inquiries, that this condition is far better than the actuality. They are not prepared to believe that in many a family the struggles are severe and the privations painful, causing a gloom all the deeper because in such glaring contrast with the general well-being and the superfluities of the rich. It is surely time to consider seriously the situation of American workingmen and their families when foreign specialists, familiar with the low

standard of life among European toilers, come to our shores and find many of our conditions lamentable and even intolerable. The fact that nothing is done to insure laborers against sickness and old age may find an apology in the favorable conditions of the past; but is not this apology rapidly losing its force? But no apology can be offered for the fact that the law has not been more strict in demanding better sanitary conditions for the laborers. In many places little or nothing is done to protect children, women, and men from accident through machinery; in some instances the contract states specifically that the employer shall not be held responsible for accidents. A physician in one of our cities wrote to von Studnitz: "The laborers are treated as machines; when worn out or wounded they are sent away." The truck system has been most shamefully abused in the past. The author just mentioned gives it as the result of his investigation that sometimes laborers received no money, but their wages went to the employer for the rent of the house, for goods in the store, and even for the pay of a pew in church. "In this case the laborers are really not much better than slaves of their masters, of whom they receive just enough for the necessaries of life. *These conditions exist in free America!*"

Not long since Massachusetts, which has done more than any other state to regulate labor and promote education, had many children who received no education in schools, and in the whole country a vast multitude of children who ought to have been in the schools did not attend them. Often the need or cupidity of the parents is at fault; they oblige the children to work in factories in order that they may appropriate their earnings. A manufacturer in Massachusetts said to von Studnitz: "Parents often swear their children elder, in order to get their wages." In

New York City a large number of children are employed in factories, and the same is true of other cities. The work in some of the New England factories required the children who attended to the spindles to walk from twelve to fifteen miles a day. Such conditions, which existed before the more recent laws were enacted, show how imperative the demand for the legal protection of those who cannot protect themselves. In numerous places the gross abuse of laborers in the past has been made impossible by the law, by the combination of laborers, by public sentiment, and by humane considerations on the part of employers. Yet it is notorious that the law is frequently inoperative, that the neglect of laborers is in many cases shameful and their abuse outrageous. In mines as well as factories their necessities are taken advantage of, and greed sets no limits but expediency to its brutal exploitation. We have "Christian" employers who know no higher law than supply and demand in their industries, whose religion requires the highest profits for least pay, and who denounce as cranks and idealists the employers who are zealous in seeking the welfare of their employees.

The conditions are of course the worst in times of crises, when many thousands are thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The traditions and surroundings may have made them indifferent to the future, so that they are not economical and but little inclined to save. Our resources and the hope that somehow he will be able to secure a living are apt to promote the feeling of ease on the part of the laborer. It is significant that sometimes native American laborers take the lead in shiftlessness and

inefficiency.* Is this one of the many evil results of a false American optimism?

While the lot of children in a home of poverty is apt to be extremely sad, on account of neglect, suffering and degradation, yet the one probably most deserving compassion is "that hardest-worked of all laborers, the poor man's wife." Much of the sacrifice and suffering are never made known, the families most worthy, as a rule, being the last to accept charity. The situation is not relieved by the fact that sometimes the misery is self inflicted, by carelessness, drink, indolence, or debauchery. This but makes more evident the necessity of studying the causes and seeking their removal. In such cases too the wife is usually the severest sufferer. "The criminal and semi-criminal men have a brutal way of making their women support them." The most hopeless condition is that where the wife is a drunkard.

The situation we here refer to is that of laborers in general, but what is said applies especially to the least skillful and the ordinary day laborer. Those who have steady employment, even if their wages are low, are better off than those whose employment is haphazard, dependent on circumstances and seasons. Dock-laborers and others who at times are very busy and then out of employment are the most improvident, spending freely when at work and liable to want when idle. We do not here speak of chronic beggars and of the disabled. Of these is true what cannot be said of laborers as such: "Weakness of some sort is the most typical characteristic of the destitute classes."

---

* Taking the reports of various charities, Dr. A. G. Warner found this to be the result of examining 7,225 applicants: "In shiftlessness and inefficiency the Americans lead all the other well-represented nationalities, having here a percentage of 9.19, as against an average of 7.51." "American Charities," 46.

Working Women.

It is a common boast of Americans that in the United States woman is better treated than in any other country of the world. Whatever the prevalent chivalry may be, the working women are in many instances excepted from its beneficent influence. In general their condition is much better than in Europe. There are many humane employers; organizations, exposures of ill treatment in the press, and the Christian sentiment in the community are safeguards. But there are also abundant instances of brutal greed to which the women are subjected. Most of all is there reason to lament that so much apathy and indifference respecting their condition prevail; an enlightened and aroused public sentiment could not tolerate the neglect and even cruelty to which they are often subjected. Many girls and women are away from home, cannot find lodgings in families, and thus are subjected to peculiar hardships and temptations.

The Fourth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, issued in 1888, is on Working Women in Large Cities, and throws much important light on their condition in industrial employment. Their average earnings are $5.24 a week, though in numerous instances it is necessarily much less. Many are obliged to support themselves, besides giving part of their wages to help support their families. A few extracts are given to show what conditions are found in some of the homes and shops. Of Brooklyn the report says: "Whole streets and districts of tenement houses are given over to poverty, filth, and vice, the sanitary and moral unwholesomeness of which is manifest." Of the homes of working women in Cincinnati we read: "The streets are dirty and closely built up with ill-constructed houses, holding from two to six families. Many poorer parts of Cincinnati are as wretched as the worst European cities, and the population looks as degraded."

New York furnishes much food for reflection. "The crowded condition of the poor and struggling is beyond belief, unless actually witnessed. This brings with it disease, death, immorality, etc. Tall rear tenements block up the small air-spaces that are insufficient even for the front, and often a third house stands behind the second. Sewerage is lacking or defective, and stenches of all kinds prevail in the poorer quarters." We turn to the places where the women labor. "As respects ventilation, a properly regulated work shop is the exception. The average room is either stuffy and close or hot and close, and even where windows abound they are seldom opened. Toilet facilities are generally scant and inadequate, a hundred workers being dependent sometimes on a single closet or sink, and that too often out of order." That girls are at times treated as mere things to increase profit, with a total disregard of the personality, is made evident by the following statement: "Whenever the employer was personally acquainted with his people the standard of conduct was apt to be excellent. In many an instance, however, the employer openly declared that so long as his work was done he did not inquire or care how bad the girls might be." It must be remembered that it is an official report which reveals this American heathenism.

Can these things be known and tolerated? Optimistic Americans, of course, throw these abominations on foreign employers. To those who have any feeling of honor left we commend the following from the same official report: "Foreigners are often found to be more considerate of their help than native born men." Things are better in Philadelphia; yet respecting the mills we read: "The sanitary condition of most is open to criticism. . . . The worsted yarn mills employ very young girls, sometimes violating the law against child labor." We close these quotations

with one referring to Providence: "The older mills are defective in light, ventilation, and space, are often without dressing rooms, and frequently the ordinary sanitary requirements are disregarded."

Slums.

Our opinion of Americans is too exalted to believe that the conditions described above would be tolerated if generally known. But is not the failure to inquire into the actual situation criminal? The crime is increased when we examine the slums of our cities. Of the much written on this subject we prefer to turn again to an official document with its trustworthy material based on thorough and impartial investigation. The Seventh Special Report of the Commissioner of Labor, 1894, gives statistics of the slum districts of Baltimore, Chicago, New York, and Philadelphia. Other American cities present peculiar features in their neglected, dirty, over-crowded districts; but the conditions described in these four are typical of the main features of the slums of American cities. The sixteen American cities of over 200,000 inhabitants contained a total population of 8,037,458 at the last census. In the districts clearly defined as slums there are, at the lowest calculation, 800,000 people, or ten per cent. of the total population. Some of these are not poor, but live there, perhaps in their own houses, for the sake of business or economy.

The slums are, as a rule, a concentration and exaggeration of ills, a condensing and crowding of evils found also in other parts of the city, but in a less congested form. The statistics of the slums ought therefore to be compared with the statistics of the city at large. Let us first take the liquor saloons for the entire city and then for the slums. Their predominance in the latter is striking and instructive.

The number of inhabitants to each saloon is given in this table:

	CITY AT LARGE.	SLUM DISTRICTS.
Baltimore,	1 to 229	1 to 105
Chicago,	1 " 212	1 " 127
New York,	1 " 200	1 " 129
Philadelphia,	1 " 870	1 " 502

Equally interesting are the statistics of arrests in the course of a year:

	CITY AT LARGE.	SLUM DISTRICTS.
Baltimore,	1 person in 14	1 in 9
Chicago,	1 " " 11	1 " 4
New York,	1 " " 18	1 " 6
Philadelphia,	1 " " 18	1 " 13

As might be expected, foreigners everywhere furnish a much larger per cent. of the slums than their proportion of the total population; but the numbers of Americans found there is also significant.

The districts selected for canvassing are among the worst in the four cities and may be regarded as centres of the slum population. The total number in the slums is of course much larger than in the parts canvassed. The total population in the cities, the total slum population, and the number in the canvassed districts are given in the following table:

	TOTAL POPULATION.	ESTIMATED TOTAL IN SLUMS.	NUMBER IN THE SLUMS CANVASSED.
Baltimore,	434,439	25,000	18,048
Chicago,	1,099,850	162,000	19,748
New York,	1,515,301	360,000	28,996
Philadelphia,	1,046,964	35,000	17,060

That makes the estimated slum population 582,000, and the population canvassed 83,852.

FOREIGN POPULATION.

	CITY AT LARGE.	SLUM DISTRICTS.
Baltimore, -	15.88 per cent.	40.21 per cent.
Chicago, - -	40.98 " "	57.51 " "
New York, -	42.23 " "	62 58 " "
Philadelphia, -	25.74 " "	60.45 " "

This makes the excess of the foreign born population of the slums above the total foreign population in the cities as follows:

Baltimore,	24.33	Chicago,	16.53
New York,	20.35	Philadelphia,	34.71

The following is a summary of the statistics of illiteracy:

	BALTIMORE.	CHICAGO.	NEW YORK.	PHILA.
Total Native Pop.	9.17	0.81	1.46	2.18
" Foreign "	12.40	8.31	14.06	11.29
SLUM DISTRICTS:				
Native Population,	8.13	5.64	7.20	8.44
Foreign "	30.62	33.86	57.69	46.61

Here the strange fact appears that the illiteracy of the native population in Baltimore at large is greater than in the slums.

It is instructive to inquire into the percentage of our slum people furnished by the different countries in the canvassed districts.

PER CENT. OF THE TOTAL POPULATION AND SLUM POPULATION BORN IN EACH SPECIFIED COUNTRY COMPARED.

	BALTIMORE.		CHICAGO.		NEW YORK.		PHILA.	
	Per cent. of Total Population.	Per cent. of Slum Population.	Per cent. of Total Population.	Per cent. of Slum Population.	Per cent. of Total Population.	Per cent. of Slum Population.	Per cent. of Total Population.	Per cent. of Slum Population.
United States, . . .	84.12	59.79	59.02	42.49	57.77	37.42	74.26	39.55
Austria-Hungary, .	.63	1.94	3.00	10.64	3.14	.33	.34	2.83
British America, . .	.12	.06	2.21	.99	.55	.09	.25	.06
China, ...	.04	.03	.05	.17	.13	.66	.07	.09
France, ...	.10	.06	.23	.30	.69	.18	.24	.16
Germany, ...	9.37	23.90	14.64	4.75	13.91	2.49	7.16	3.19
Great Britain, . . .	.89	.81	3.56	.95	3.19	.70	4.65	.82
Ireland, ...	3.08	2.10	6.37	4.46	12.57	5.21	10.60	4.31
Italy, ...	.19	1.81	.52	16.73	2.64	45.27	.65	24.15
Netherlands, ...	.02	.02	.49	.06	.09	.02	.02	.13
Norway & Sweden .	.08	.23	5.90	.18	.57	.06	.30	.06
Poland, ...	.22	4.43	2.19	6.65	.45	3.10	.21	9.66
Russia, ...	.93	4.54	.70	10.42	3.22	2.41	.75	13.64
Spain & Portugal, .	.01	.02	.01	.01	.06	.05	.02	.02
Other Foreign Countries,	.20	.26	1.11	1.20	1.02	2.01	.48	1.33
Total Foreign, . . .	15.88	40.21	40.98	57.51	42.23	62.58	25.74	60.45

Throughout we find the per cent. of native Americans smaller in the slums than in the city at large; it is smallest in Philadelphia. In the slum district canvassed in Baltimore the percentage of Germans is surprising; in the other cities they furnish a less proportion of the slums than of the total population. In not one of the four cities is the per cent. of the Irish in the slum canvassed as great as in the city at large. The percentage of Italians, Poles and Russians is significant; they also furnish a large proportion of the illiterates. In New York nearly one-half of the slum population canvassed comes from Italy, while less than three per cent. of the total population are from that country.

The misrule of our large cities is often attributed to foreigners. In the four cities the natives outnumber the foreigners from about eight to thirty-four per cent. But

men often emigrate more easily than women, hence the former predominate among our foreign population. Therefore the proportion of the foreign vote is in excess of the foreigners at large. This vote is as follows:

	NATIVE.	FOREIGN.
Baltimore, - -	79.87	20.13
Chicago, - -	49.38	50.62
New York, - -	50.07	49.93
Philadelphia, -	70.48	29.52

In Chicago the foreign vote actually outnumbers the native vote, and in New York the Americans have barely the advantage. In Boston, Milwaukee and other cities the foreign vote is no doubt larger than in any of the above. But the misrule is largely due to the neglect of duty on the part of the native born. Where they have the majority and, as a rule, in many other instances, their influence for good could be made to predominate if they cared to exert it. The Irish have a predilection for politics; but they can be responsible for the outrages of the New York city government only if the other inhabitants are outrageously negligent. That city contains 190,418 Irish, 210,723 Germans, and 875.358 native Americans.

Among the surprises is the proportion of colored people in the slums. In only one of the four cities, Chicago, is their percentage of the slums greater than of the total population. The small percentage in Baltimore is significant.

	CITY AT LARGE.	SLUM DISTRICTS.
Baltimore, -	15.45	4.12
Chicago, - -	1.30	5.69
New York, -	1.56	.54
Philadelphia, -	3.76	2.53

This official report confirms the result of other inquiries that the slums are as much a crime as an abomination. They are an unmitigated evil, but not a necessary evil. It is false that with our present system they are inevitable. Equally false is it that the intemperance, the vice, the thriftlessness, and the inefficiency of the inhabitants of the slums, are responsible for these vile districts. The responsibility rests with the nine-tenths not in the slums and with the government which this large majority institutes. Many laborers are found in the slums; but there are many also in other parts, and there is no reason for instituting slums for their benefit. The occupations of the inhabitants are shown by the statistics to be as varied as in other sections of the city. The common notion that the low earnings drive the people to the slums is proved false; it is much more true that they go there because there is no other place for them. After becoming accustomed to the disgusting environment they naturally sink to a degraded standard which robs them of ambition to change. Look at the report: "The earnings of the people living in the slum districts canvassed are quite up to the average earnings of the people generally and at large, but as there are no data with which to make comparisons of average earnings, the results of the investigations must practically stand alone; yet, from all that can be learned from various sources, the statement made is believed to be correct." The figures show that however much the slums promote poverty and degradation, it is not poverty which makes the slums a necessity. In Baltimore the average weekly earnings of the people in the canvassed slum districts who are engaged in remunerative employments were $8.65½; in Chicago, $9.88½; in New York, $8.36; in Philadelphia, $8.68. Reducing the earnings to families, we find the average weekly earnings per family in Baltimore $15.99; in Chicago,

$21.60½; in New York, $17.58; in Philadelphia, $19.01½. Many thousands in other parts of the cities fall below this average.

The slums exist as a testimony of the flagrant neglect of the community and municipality. The guilt rests chiefly on the "first" citizens who are the most powerful and yet in point of political duties are the worst citizens. By proper legal enactments and by a rigorous execution of the laws every slum street and ally and back yard and tenement house would disappear and no new ones could be created. Philanthropy can do much; experiment has proved that the erection of suitable homes for the toilers can even be made a good investment. But individual effort must be backed by public effort and by the law and the authorities. A change in the homes and in the total external environment must be accompanied by educational influences, by moral reform, by temperance, and by a high-toned religion. Not only for the voters, but also for the immigrants an educational test is required. Now and forever the deluge of ignorance from Italy, Poland, Russia, Hungary, and other countries ought to be stopped. An ignorance which can flourish in a monarchy may be the destruction of a republic.

We are not yet considering the remedies for the existing social ills; but these suggestions are specially in place in immediate connection with the ills described.

Labor Organizations.

Some of the evils now so much complained of have existed as long as the republic; they are in fact found everywhere, seem to be as old as civilization, and to belong to the natural imperfection of social conditions. Throughout our history social contrasts have prevailed, and have produced dissatisfaction and complaint. But as the contrasts have developed so the spirit of opposi-

tion to them has grown. This opposition has been organized, and the strength given by union has inspired the hope that evils produced by these contrasts can be overcome. The evils have grown, but so has the consciousness and the exposure of them, as well as the power, the determination, and the hope of conquering them. The growth of the republic has been a process of conscious disintegration, a process of discrimination, men have been separated into classes, they have been massed into opposing hosts and are marshalling for the battle, skirmishes in great numbers having already taken place. The organizations of labor for defence and offence date back to the beginning of the century, but their continuous development and great power have been characteristic of the last few decades. The general change in industrial conditions, the growth of cities and the massing of laborers, the increased power of capitalism and the awakening of workingmen, furnish the conditions for the more compact and more permanent combination of laborers.

So important are these organizations that they have received careful study both from home and foreign specialists; here we can consider them but briefly so far as immediately connected with our problem. They have made laborers a solidarity as never before; they have developed their consciousness as a class whose interests are mutual and whose efforts for relief must be united; and they have intensified the conflict between labor and capital. The brotherhood of labor forms the army of the modern crusaders. In such organizations the unconscious, the semi-conscious, and the contagious influences have always been factors of peculiar power. But educational forces also prevail; especially in England have they exerted great influence in the Trade Unions. The English organizations have decided advantages over the American. From gener-

ation to generation the laborers have been disciplined in their industries; the country is small, the laborers in mines and factories are concentrated within narrow limits; their organizations are of long standing and can easily co-operate. In the United States the laborers are scattered over a vast extent of territory, making union difficult; their occupations are very varied, often but few laborers being together; sometimes their interests seem to conflict, so that harmony becomes almost impossible; especially is co-operation among the agricultural laborers difficult on account of their isolation; an independent spirit prevails among many Americans which leads them to seek relief by means of their own exertions rather than in combinations; the numerous foreigners with their different languages and national preferences and peculiarities have been in the way of union; and the conditions for a long time were such as not to make such organizations as much a necessity here as in England. In the United States peculiar interests in the North and South, the East and the West, divide the people into sections, and this works distraction also among the laborers.

The American organizations, being of more recent origin, have not the experience or development found in some of the European lands. They have not become a united political force, but may do so very rapidly, and are likely to be the most powerful factor in our future politics; nor have they, as a rule, become socialistic, though in many instances they are tending strongly in that direction, socialists are gaining power as leaders, and the socialistic state furnishes a definite goal for hope and effort. Among our national questions those pertaining to money and the tariff will be settled or will recede into the background, while labor will assume overwhelming importance. There can be no doubt that if labor is once completely organized it will

be the ruling power in the affairs of the state. If the present development continues laborers will not be alone; the growing abuses and corruptions in high places will unite with them the small traders and the people generally. It is a growing conviction that the public have a common foe and must combine to hurl him from his throne. If plutocracy builds bastiles and makes arsenals the means of enslaving the public, the people themselves will form an army as irresistible as a martial force in the field as a political force at the ballot box. The toilers who work for what they earn are incensed at the means used to get possessions without earning them. The time cannot be distant when political peculation will be an object of most bitter attack; signs are already appearing that laborers are intent on stopping the corruptions, especially the thieving which vitiates politics. For this purpose their Trade Unions as a political force will be most effective. Heretofore the labor organizations of the land have shown their greatest strength in regulating wages and in strikes. If they are just in their demands and moderate in their actions they are sure of the popular sympathy in their movements for the uplifting of the laboring classes. There can hardly be a doubt that the labor conflicts of this country will largely be determined by the character and the development of these organizations. While they may become the source of revolutionary tendencies and lead to destruction, they can also be the means of elevating the laborers by educating them, by making them conscious of their strength, and by defending their common interests in the community, in the state, and in society. These organizations are the most efficient means of self-help given to laborers; hence it is to their interest to make them as strong and as perfect as possible.

Our Danger.

The energy, the enterprise, the aspiration, and the ideals of the American laborer are the elements which inspire confidence in him. But they are also the very factors which increase his dissatisfaction if he sees his resources taken from him, and will lead him to greater extremes in case of conflicts. The present condition of things presents no hope for the peaceable solution of the labor problems. If the problems are to be settled by the organization of labor on the one hand, and of capital on the other, then an appeal to force amid the bitterness of the parties and the severity of the conflict is inevitable. The present trend favors monopolies, and their industrial supremacy is rapidly being assured. The state of things thereby produced may become intolerable. This process of concentrating wealth will only serve to arouse the opposition of those who regard themselves thereby wronged and impoverished. Unless this concentration and the consequent impoverishment can be prevented legally, there is the greatest danger of a determination of the masses to seize the control of affairs. With the conviction that they are systematically robbed, with no confidence in the law as a protector against the wrongs they suffer, animated by that spirit of anarchy so characteristic of American life in times of great excitement, with no standing army to confront them, and with the government and police virtually in their hands, what will not the outraged, disappointed, and despairing American laborers, with the power actually and consciously in their hands, attempt?

Our Safety.

The safety of the republic consists in looking these things fairly in the face, judging them according to their real merits, trying to meet the danger by studying the means of relief, enacting such laws as the situation requires, and effecting such

social changes as will introduce more equitable conditions into society. The greatest enemy is the man who says, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace;" and the promoters of despair and ultimate destruction are the men who adopt the let alone theory and hold that all things will right themselves. That way madness lies and revolution. But if the people are aroused, if they earnestly consider the Social Problem, and if privilege, wealth, scholarship, and religion combine to study and meet the social demands, then the United States may be the first country to solve peaceably the existing Social Problem.

Our greatest danger may, however, lie where our safety should be, namely, in our churches, in our halls of legislation, in our courts of justice, and in our press. With these on the side of right and humanity, the forces of evil can be overcome; but with these on the side of wrong and inhumanity, they are far more dangerous than any existing revolutionary elements. The church which throws its influence in favor of extravagance, display, and materialism, will help to undermine the ethical and spiritual forces of society. It will foster atheism. If the halls of legislation are used to promote unjust accumulations and oppressive corporations, the people will lose attachment for the government and its institutions, and will welcome their destruction. Political corruptions may flourish for awhile, but they develop the very spirit which will eventually annihilate the political parties which are the sources of the corruptions. The courts of justice or injustice which bend the laws for the rich and against the poor will lead the people to take the law into their own hands, to attempt to execute justice by unjust means. These courts promote lynching, violence, mob rule, and anarchy. What can be expected of an indignant people who see that the courts and lawyers seem to exist for the sake of proving how completely jus-

tice can be cheated and criminals freed? No enlightened country can long permit its legal talent to be used to defend crime at all hazards, when every ethical consideration shows that the lawyer should be the nation's defender of law and innocence, and the uncompromising destroyer of crime. The press which treats wealth as the supreme consideration, the industries as a concern chiefly of capitalists and employers, and the laboring masses as mere adjuncts of capital, will hasten that revolution which it ought to forestall. Laborers cannot but feel that they are insulted if ignored in the very concerns which deeply affect their persons and interests.

The press which insists that there are no "classes" in the United States may be duped itself, but has little prospect of duping its readers. Whatever the law may say, in reality the classes are about as distinctly marked as in Europe. We have a capitalistic class and a laboring class, just as we have our criminal and our pauper classes. Some journals insist that "the people" and "the masses" include all Americans, there being no distinctions which put any of the population apart from these. It is, however, notorious that there are many, and their number seems to be on the increase, who industrially, religiously, and socially stand aloof from the great body of the people and the masses. These and other facts are only made more glaring by efforts to hide them, and the evils involved are aggravated by statements which try to cover the iniquity. But the press is right in emphasizing the noble characteristics of much of the wealth in the United States. The whole truth must be known if the remedy for existing evils is to be found and applied.

They are not far wrong who speak of great centres of industries as places where powder lies around loose and only waits for a spark to produce an explosion. The

match may be furnished by a strike or some sudden outburst of passion. Unfortunately, the masses in many instances have little hope that remedial agencies will be furnished by the classes from which most ought to be expected; nor have they much confidence in the existing political parties and in the judiciary. Unless the present ills are removed, there are multitudes who are determined to hurl tyrants and oppressors from their thrones. Employers, business men, and farmers declare as emphatically as laborers that the devouring greed and gross injustice of the few at the expense of the many must cease. If the rule of the American people means the welfare of the American people, then the tyranny and oppression of individual mammonists and of soulless corporations have had their day. The appeal of demagogues to the demoniac passions of an infuriated mob is despicable; but the only way to prevent revolution is to remove the causes of revolution. It is useless to speak of preserving and sweetening the nation, if the very salt which is to do it has lost its savor. There is no hope of safety, unless capital and labor can be made co-operative, unless wealth will put ethics in place of greed, unless political parties become national instead of partisan in spirit, unless the courts protect the poor and oppressed, unless the church becomes spiritual instead of materialistic, and unless laborers not only see justice done, but also do justice to one another and to the other members of society.

What Taine calls "spontaneous anarchy," which was the precursor and inaugurator of the French revolution, is most of all to be dreaded in times when the masses are excited and turbulent. Frightful workings of this spontaneous anarchy are already beheld in the United States. There is a point where it may yet be checked by reforms; but if it passes this limit it will wildly sweep before it reason

and conscience and authority, with horrors indescribable and destruction the most awful.

Literature.

For the study of the Social Problem in the United States the daily and weekly press, the monthly magazines and the quarterlies are very helpful. The American Federation of labor issues a directory of the Labor Press which gives the names of 107 papers, and the list is far from being complete. There are extreme journals in various languages which are not mentioned. "The American Federationist," Washington, D. C., a monthly, represents the more moderate labor movement. In the list of papers given in the directory such names as "Lucifer" and "Firebrand" are significant. Many of these papers are in the interest of particular trades and labor organizations, and their influence on the masses is incalculable. Reports of labor meetings and conventions are also important. Among laborers themselves and in their organizations their views and tendencies ought to be studied. Their journals at times exaggerate evils and make universal certain grievances which are local. There are also many papers which are under capitalistic dominance, which systematically misrepresent the cause of labor. Their persistent falsification of facts and statistics, and their advocacy of an effete political economy, cannot check the full exposure of existing ills, but they serve to increase the alienation and embitterment of laborers. Official accounts of the actual situation are given in the reports of the Census Bureau, and in the very valuable annual and special reports of the United States Commissioner of Labor, also in the reports of the Labor Bureaux of the several states. The labor laws of the different states are given in the second special report of the United States Commissioner. The reports on Slums and on Working Women are full of important information. In "The Industrial Evolution of the

United States," by Carroll D. Wright, United States Commissioner of Labor, Flood and Vincent, New York, a general view of industrial development is given, besides a discussion of The Labor Movement and of The Influence of Machinery on Labor. "Progress and Poverty," by Henry George, and "Looking Backward," by Bellamy, are well known. "The Labor Movement: The Problem of To-Day," edited by G. E. McNeill, Bridgman & Co., Boston, discusses the labor problem in the United States from the standpoint of the laborers. It is indispensable to students of the trend among the laboring classes. The twenty-four chapters are by prominent labor leaders and by others in sympathy with their cause. The large volume contains a history of the labor movement in America, chapters on the different trades and on labor organizations, together with discussions of the problem of to-day, the hours of labor, the army of the unemployed, and similar subjects. Professor Ely's book on "The Labor Movement in America," Crowell & Co., New York and Boston, is devoted to labor organizations and abounds in valuable material on that subject. Two works by German specialists who came to the United States to study the labor problem are valuable. Arthur von Studnitz, "*Nordamerikanische Arbeiterverhæltnisse*," Duncker and Humblot, Leipzig, and W. A. Sartorius, "*Der moderne Socialismus in den Vereinigten Staaten*," Bahr, Berlin. Numerous works of Americans discuss labor or some of its phases. George Gunton, "A Critical Examination of the Labor Problem," D. Appleton & Co. Dr. A. G. Warner's "American Charities," Crowell & Co., is a careful investigation of an important subject. H. D. Lloyd's "Wealth Against Commonwealth," Harper and Brothers, New York, is directed against monopolies. Excellent hints on the early condition of labor are found in J. B. McMaster's "History of the United States," Appleton. On the general situation see Bryce's "American Commonwealth," Macmillan.

CHAPTER V.

THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

The Solution.

From the effort to fathom the meaning of the Social Problem we now turn to the inquiry into its solution. Students are bewildered as they contemplate the magnitude and complexity of the problem; but with the question of the solution the most perplexing difficulties begin. The preceding pages give some idea of the nature of the task that is to be accomplished. How the work is to be done now becomes the question of absorbing interest. To what discipline or disciplines shall we resort for the answer? Political economy of the old school is said to speak in the indicative mood, not in the imperative; it considers what is, but does not inquire into what ought to be. It is evident that this kind of economics cannot furnish the solution we need. Natural science and human history are likewise absorbed by the actuality. Our present inquiry, however, leads us into ethical questions, to a consideration of the demands made by reason and conscience with respect to the social situation. We have certain ideals of social justice and with these we compare the social actuality. As we discover the painful conflict between what is and what ought to be, the best impulses of our nature and of our age urge us so to transform the real condition as to make it conform to the ideal demands.

For earnest social thinkers and workers the investigation of this transformation is as important as difficult. All who are inspired by the hope of human progress will prize

a knowledge of the nature of the Social Problem chiefly for the reason that this knowledge may aid them in finding some way out of the difficulties presented. We must dismiss all theories of an easy or speedy solution; perhaps even a bloodless one is out of the question. Aside from dreamers and dogmatists no one claims to know just how the progress required for the establishment of an equitable and satisfactory state of society is to be promoted. Among specialists no consensus is found respecting the means to the desired end; indeed, further study and evolution are required to show even what end is most desirable. For centuries beautiful theories on the best state of society have hovered over humanity; but are they really the best? Are they practicable? If not Utopias, how are they to be realized? In spite of grand social achievements, the entire past is marked by the failures at social realization on the part of reformers, schools, churches, and states.

We cannot therefore be surprised that men controlled by history and experience, rather than by the hope that animates the human heart, should hesitate to make a specialty of this part of our subject. Many pass lightly over the question of the solution, giving a criticism of the methods proposed by others and some hints respecting the course to be pursued, but no full and systematic treatment. Evidently the time for a final decision has not yet come, and some, as if apprehensive of evil results, deprecate a discussion of the means of solution. A hopeless stage in the crisis must have been reached if revolution or anarchy is regarded as the inevitable result of investigation. But is any one so foolish as to believe that at this age of the world investigation can be checked? The very emergencies emphasize the need of thorough and unreserved inquiry. If a deluge is to come let us know it so that we

may prepare an ark of safety. Only the lovers of darkness hate the light.

Preparation.

There ought to be no need of emphasizing the demand for special preparation in order that the solution may be properly considered; yet many propose to solve the problem without even grasping its meaning. The author's experience in Europe and America convinced him that the problem is so often solved easily and dogmatically because no adequate conception is formed of what it really involves. He has beheld thousands of laborers applaud revolutionary and anarchistic theories, of whose depth of meaning and far-reaching effects they could have no knowledge. Illiterate men and women and even children are dogmatizing about a socialistic state, of which no one knows anything from experience or actual investigation. The ignorance of professional men with respect to our problem is as notorious as it is freely admitted by them. There are discussions of the subject by educated men which excite the ridicule of the laborer and mar the matters they would mend. The information has been generously volunteered that preachers deserve the palm for stupidity in social affairs; many are, however, becoming the most diligent students of society. But whatever progress the clergy make in this direction, the pulpit receives numerous warnings that it is in danger of rushing hastily and blindly into the discussion as if, from its standpoint, the mastery of the problem and its solution were a matter-of-course, requiring neither especial study nor profound thought.

It is the more necessary to consider the preparation required and to weigh the method of procedure because class prejudice threatens to monopolize the subject, the public mind is inflamed so that passion is made the arbiter, and the haste to solve the problem leads men to jump

inconsiderately at conclusions and to turn wishes and opinions into axioms. With all the realism of the day, there are social visionaries who pursue their dreams, regardless of fact and reason. Multitudes have ceased to be inquirers; they make their theories final and are most dogmatic in realms beyond the reach of knowledge. One need but study the blind, passionate forces underlying the wild agitations of the day, in order to learn that men must come to themselves before they can come to a rational and fruitful consideration of the solution of our problem. We must remember that we have to take into account conditions which are new in history, and that we deal with a variety of social agencies whose working cannot be definitely foretold. For efficiency in the solution we can lay no stress on theories which spring from our own class or family, from our environment, tradition, or current opinion, rather than from a thorough investigation of the entire situation. The world is to be moved, and the fulcrum and lever must be adequate to the end. The crisis makes men slaves of social movements; but masters are the need of the hour. Not only is special preparation required for rightly apprehending the means of solution, but also for successful work in promoting the needed progress.

Construction.

The questions already considered give some idea of the tempting field our problem offers to speculation. Philosophers, sociologists, statesmen, economists, and theologians have been fascinated by the great themes and deep principles involved, and have reveled in the theories of the nature, the evolution, and the perfection of society. It is significant that from Plato to Bellamy the remedy for social ills has been so largely consigned to novels. Our theme requires speculation and imagination; without these we cannot forecast the future of society and estimate the efficiency of means

for social progress; but since we deal with matter-of-fact realism we cannot afford to take our footing from solid ground. Some lose themselves in the exposure of ills, and a kind of mania has seized the age to become aware of the worst features of the social condition. It is necessary for the age to become conscious of itself if it is to make advances. Society tolerates many things because it is not aware of them; it need but know them to make them intolerable. But the exposure of ills is not their cure. Denunciation and criticism have their place; but damnation is not salvation.

Our age has been pronounced strong in critical negation, yet too weak to pass from destruction to construction. We want to know what ought to be gotten rid of, but also how to get rid of it and what to put in its place. Whatever stress may be placed on the destructive forces, we must emphasize in connection with them the constructive ones. If we must pass through anarchism and nihilism, let us at least consider what edifying powers will eventually put society on a secure foundation. Perhaps the threatened destruction can be averted by the study and application of the constructive forces.

Existing Forces.

We are limited to the use of the existing powers; no more in society than in nature are we creators. It is our province to discover, develop, and direct the powers already created. What are the social factors and forces? A knowledge of their nature, of their complex relations and intricate workings, is the condition for their effective use. Important lessons may be learned from the social agencies which have proved effective in history. Ignorance in this respect leads men to propose as new what are really old measures, and to claim for forces effects which past tests do not justify. If present social agencies are not effective the reasons should

be discovered. Expectation is on tip-toe, and something new and unusual is looked for; yet it may be that nothing new is required, but only the amendment, development, and adaptation of what already exists. Perhaps with respect to institutions there is less need of destruction and new creations than of reformation and evolution. Some exalt the ethical factor in human progress at the expense of the religious; religion is even rejected as an element of human advancement, the charge being made that it has not accomplished what was claimed for it. Those in the ethical movement should remember that the same charge of inefficiency is made against ethics, in the interest of industrial agencies and material forces. Religion, morals, education, and other elements of culture may, however, need reformation, reinvigoration, and adaptation. We do not know where to look for social forces different from those of the past and the present; and until we find others, nothing is left us but to make most effective the agencies in our possession.

Traditionalism.

Yet we do not question that with the advance of thought and the progress of humanity new methods and new means will be discovered. In this hope we are warranted by the marked development in sociology, in economics, in the science of politics, in social ethics, in theology, and in the study of the Social Problem. New light may be expected from researches in history, especially from the study of institutions and various forms of human association; we are also beginning to learn the importance of the environment to society and the value of statistics. In his "Lectures on the Industrial Revolution in England," Arnold Toynbee emphasized the importance of history for understanding the present. "It would be well if, in studying the past, we could always bear in mind the problems of the present,

and go to that past to seek large views of what is of lasting importance to the human race." He urges students "to pay special attention to the history of the social problems which are agitating the world now, for you may be sure that they are problems not of temporary but of lasting importance." Yet it is not the past projected into the present, but adapted to the present, which is of most use for our purpose. Some traditional factors have unquestionably become effete.

As we are dealing with new problems, or with old problems in a new form, we may rest assured that worn-out methods cannot meet the emergencies of the case. No power can save a church, a government, a school, a political economy, or any system whatever, which cannot adapt itself to existing circumstances and meet the peculiar needs of the age. Our problems differ vastly from those of the Reformation and the French revolution; they are larger and more complicated than the questions which agitated Europe in 1848; both in area and in difficulty they surpass the problems which were settled by the civil war in the United States. The old methods are not adapted to the solution of problems altogether different.

Among the most important and most difficult of tasks is the determination of the traditional forces which shall remain and those which shall be superseded. Between conservatism and radicalism, or by means of a union of the truth in both, the way of progress is found. Not a word need be said about that traditional dogmatism whose doom is inevitable, however much it may now retard development. It is the ultimate resort of ignorance, impotence, and prejudice. Far better is it to admit that we have not the key to the solution than to harp on any traditional but ineffective methods, or to ring the changes on a favorite but unadaptable dogma. Theories may be valid and dogmas true, which nevertheless fail because inapplicable.

Despair.

We take no account of such as say that there have always been Social Problems and always will be, and that they will solve themselves. Some points will no doubt be settled somehow and that in the near future. But how? Strong, resolute, and ever-growing revolutionary forces are at work which threaten the present social fabric and what many regard as the highest interests of humanity. There are "men of deed" who will not let things alone, who profess to have nothing to lose by change but everything to gain, and who are determined to bring about that change in their own way. We know that in revolutionary eras the spirit of destruction grows rapidly, and that then all the worthless and violent elements are impelled to flock around the black banner of devastation. To let things go may mean to let them go to ruin.

Far more worthy of notice than such triflers are the earnest students whom a kind of paralysis seizes, induced by despair, in view of the magnitude and difficulty of the problem. Especially futile does it seem to attempt to check the rush to destruction where the violent revolutionary forces make such headway as in some countries of continental Europe. "God may help, but man cannot," exclaims an eminent German theologian after a survey of the destructive movements. Another opponent of the violent revolution declares that the efforts of monarchs and the pope, of statesmen and parliaments, of Protestant and Catholic Churches, to check the rush to destruction is vain. He thinks the German army the only power left to resist the force; but in this very army the social democrats are trained to the highest degree of efficiency, so as to be most thoroughly prepared for the decisive blow when the opportune moment comes. Still another writer affirms that the solution may be thought out, but can never be realized in

practice. Perhaps the despair produced by the overwhelming demands made by the problem is the greatest danger to which the earnest investigator is subject.

Is our Problem Solvable?

These considerations force on us the question, whether the solution of our problem is possible. The answer lies largely in the domain of ethics, and ethical progress is held to be discouragingly slow. A number of writers discourse on the marvelous progress of the nineteenth century, and then add that in respect to morals there seem to have been retrogression and a loss of force. Some who are in haste for social improvement emphasize the change of economic conditions to the neglect of morals, having no hope in speedy moral regeneration. In view of difficulties which appear to be insuperable, not a few pronounce our problem unsolvable, declaring that the evils complained of are inherent in nature, or in man, or in the social relations, and that therefore they are inevitable. Some make God responsible for the existing condition and regard it sacrilegious to propose changes in the order established by divine law. This leads to a thoughtless and hopeless dismissal of the problem. In America the problem has been pronounced an evidence of that unrest which is characteristic of human nature; and "the eternal struggle" has been declared to be the only solution. No doubt the struggle will never cease; but we cannot well dismiss the matter with this reflection.

There is another view of the subject. A distinction should be made between the Social Problem of humanity and *our* Social Problem. We do not believe that the Social Problem can be solved once for all time, so that the solution given now will banish it forever. This generation cannot do the work of the next; each age has its own evils, and needs, and problems, and no present solution can meet

all the demands of the future. But *our* Social Problem is the peculiar task given to our age, and is distinct from the problem of humanity and of future ages. But little reflection is required to show that the solution of our Social Problem must be practicable. It cannot be our problem unless it is solvable by us. It is not a problem how I can step on my shoulders or jump across my shadow. *Perpetuum mobile* and squaring the circle cease to be problems so soon as proved unsolvable. New statements of our problem may be required; all that is not problematical ought to be taken from it; but so far as it is actually our problem it is solvable by us. Were it proved that it is unsolvable, that itself would be a solution; the problem would cease to be problematical and would vanish as a problem. Among the most urgent needs is that discrimination which will deprive our Social Problem of all myths and illusions, and give in a definite form just what is problematical and therefore solvable.

This will present a basis on which we can labor with hope. By solving our part of the problem of humanity, which is the only problem given us to solve, we may help coming generations to solve theirs; perhaps we shall make their work entirely different from what it would be if we transmitted our problem unsolved to them. Even if our solution is but partial it will change the problem. Thus in the great questions which are given to humanity each age has its particular answer to give; and the work of each generation is for the benefit of humanity at large and for all time. By government and institutions of various kinds some evils which are now dragged from age to age may be permanently removed; but no paradise can be expected. Social Problems will be solved, and yet always there will be Social Problems. The solutions may be endless and ought to be continuous; much in them may be tentative,

cumulative, a plant that with its growth gains power of growth. Our problem is solvable; respecting the endless problem of humanity a progressive solution, however, best expresses the possibility. This can leave no question as to the sense in which our discussion of the solution of the Social Problem is to be understood.

Laws of Progress.

The deeper movements of the age reveal two tendencies of significance for the solution of our problem. The one tendency consigns human affairs to the reign of natural law, and the other subjects man more and more to the control of institutionalism. Modern life has so largely become institutional that personal initiative seems to lose its value compared with the importance of institutions. We are almost tempted to class our industrial system among the institutions in which we are at present obliged to live and move. The family, the church, the club, the numerous organizations for various purposes, the school, the state, so absorb attention and action that they seem to be the sole agencies for promoting human progress. To this must be added the fact that the tendency of natural science has been to reduce individual and social action to natural law and physical force. This is done by materialists, it is an axiom with Karl Marx and other socialists, and has become dominant with a large class of writers who are not professedly materialistic.

An attempt is even made to reduce sociology to a natural science. The total failure of this method to account for human phenomena has not saved society from the effort to make the social processes purely physical. The effect on our problem is great. Why trouble ourselves about the course of social events if they depend ultimately on the efficiency of natural law? This cuts the nerve of voluntary energy. It denies the need or even possibility of ethical purpose in human progress, and prevents the creation of a

social ideal and efforts for its realization. Without claiming to solve the ultimate metaphysical questions of materialism and spiritualism, we must, if true to our present state of knowledge, supplement natural by personal laws. We are obliged to admit a personal factor which, so far as we can see, no physical force or action explains. This means that we recognize powers in the human personality which are distinct from those found in nature so far as now understood. This is simply taking things as we find them. An exact definition of *natural* might avoid misunderstanding. Does it mean material? Then mind is excluded until its materiality is established. Natural is, however, frequently used in the sense of *normal*, what is usual, customary, common. In that sense it has a proper application to human affairs, and this meaning has become the rule in a number of disciplines. Law as used respecting history, sociology, political economy, politics, ethics, religion, is apt to savor too much of natural processes, unless defined as indicating what is customary rather than physical. The personality has elements whose depth and variability we have not fathomed; volition, whatever causative factors lie at its root, cannot be scientifically estimated; no prevision can foretell the advent of a Moses, an Alexander, a Luther, Bacon, Washington, Napoleon, or Bismarck; and it is folly to pretend to scientific prevision in personal and social affairs so long as we are confined to mere guesses respecting the factors which are the determining forces in human movements.

Much that the student of social affairs cannot reduce to absolute law, may nevertheless afford a field for fruitful inquiry. So far as he studies the principles of society he will be saved from that narrow specialization which confines its attention to the working of matter, and from that infers the nature and law of all being. He will appreciate

the struggle for existence, the evolution it produces, and the necessity of the survival of the fittest, without making survival among brutes the law for survival in human society. Where nature makes brute strength and physical adaptation to the natural environment the fittest to survive, he may find intellectual and ethical factors the most worthy of survival; and instead of the adaptation of an individual to his environment, he may find it necessary to adapt the environment to the individual.

By giving the personal and social laws a place beside the natural laws, there will be room and demand for human initiative, and impulse will be given to think and plan and work for the development of society, and responsibility will be felt for human progress. In himself the student will find those personal laws which transcend and supplement the physical laws. Every strong individuality is, in some measure, a law unto itself; and if it is a wise individuality it will include in this law a consideration of nature and the environment. We treat the solution of the Social Problem rationally only when we take into account the social possibility as well as the social actuality. The end to be attained being fixed, the causes of social progress must be learned, and an application of the remedial agents to the present needs of society made. In humanity we behold different grades of culture, from the savage stage to the summit of civilization. How can the lower be elevated to the higher? An actual exaltation of the lower classes is needed, a change in the individuals themselves. But their inner change and the change in conditions may have to be correlated and parallel. The process must be gradual, as climbing a steep mountain; it must be logical, each step at the right time, in the right place, in systematic order. The progressive forces must be studied, education, morals, religion, the industries, organizations, institutions, individual

effort, all that contributes to social welfare. There may be volcanic action in the course of progress ; but we must not expect an explosion to land society on a star. No single step can take us from the real to the ideal. These Utopian methods we leave to romance.

Human progress is too arduous a task to be otherwise than slow. This becomes evident so soon as we consider the ills to be eradicated and the good to be established. Whole ages are spent in combating ills and hardly any visible progress is made ; perhaps the evils have multiplied. We must not forget that ethics, religion, intellectuality are not pushed from one generation into another, but each child, each generation, begins at the beginning, and what it achieves, amid the inheritances from the past, is its own work. So great is the task before us that we can hardly hope to do more than check the course on a false track leading to worse and worse evils, and to point out the right road for future ages, and begin to pursue it ourselves.

Permanent Social Factors.

It is the abiding social forces which are of most moment. An invention that dies with its inventor is not a social factor. So there may be many thoughts, methods, means, agencies, of individuals, which do not enter the fibre of the social organism and therefore cannot promote its future development. The man who has experience and wisdom and scholarship for himself only, a kind of private luxury, is not a social power. It is evident that we cannot identify individual with social energy ; just as there are monks and hermits whose isolation robs society of their influence, so there are individuals in society who give but a part of themselves to the furtherance of human progress. So far as voluntary activity is concerned there are comparatively few who get beyond their selfish ends and family concerns and the affairs of their particular society and

environment, into the interest of society at large and the progress of humanity. Their thoughts, their feelings, and their choices do not reach beyond the narrow circle in which they move. What humanity obtains from such is incidental rather than intended. What now are the social factors, especially the permanent ones? Can they be definitely determined?

The permanent social factors can be put under the head of what has been socially instituted, taking the expression in a larger sense than what is usually meant by institutions. These institutions are, of course, permanent social factors. The family, the school, the church, the voluntary organizations of various kinds, and the state with its manifold agencies, are institutions which have long been among the most efficient means of human progress. Whoever inaugurates a new institution of this kind, say an association for any human purpose, or improves an existing institution, giving new force or new direction to the school or church, makes a permanent contribution to the social factors. This kind of activity is at once recognized as different from that which centres in the individual, beginning and ending with him .But these institutions do not exhaust the permanent social factors. Among these factors we include language, the product, conscious and unconscious, of countless individuals in unnumbered ages; literature, in which humanity has deposited its thoughts and ideals and feelings; religion, the realm of faith and hope; the precepts, ethical, educational, industrial, in which, in the form of maxims, proverbs, and parables, many generations have compressed their experience; principles and ideas which move the heart and shape the life, working as creative energies in the nations; methods and means which have become a second nature to man and are a controlling power in society. The present is the heir of the entire

past; we live in institutions which have come down from time immemorial; so we have dogmas, fashions, customs, traditions, which often work with the force of absolute laws; we are born into an atmosphere which teems with notions, with tendencies, opinions, that affect us with a force almost irresistible.

All these social factors and powers have been instituted as permanent agencies, affecting generation after generation. Plato, Aristotle, Bacon, Kant, originated or promulgated ideas which society appropriated and made its own forces. This enables us to appreciate how the individual becomes a permanent social factor by contributing something which becomes an abiding deposit in society, be it a thought that lives, a method that continues to work, a deed that shapes others so as to make them a social power, an institution which lasts. Many a man exerts an influence which becomes a permanent social factor without his knowledge; power goes from him to others which he cannot estimate; how it will work he can no more see than he can behold the seed grow which he plants; but what he does may be food to the social organism, strengthening and developing it, and becoming a part of its very substance. No one can live in society without promoting its growth or decay; but there are degrees in the influence exerted, some of it purposive, the rest as unconscious as the action of a law of nature.

The Problem Left to Laborers.

No class has a monopoly of the Social Problem, yet it has been relegated to laborers as if solely their concern. Not only is this amazing and significant of the situation, but it also enhances the difficulty of the solution. Do not wealth and scholarship rest on labor? If workingmen make their passion their reason, it is largely because the other classes so persistently ignore their rea-

sonable claims. Wealth and scholarship have looked with indifference on the agony of the lowly as they nobly strove to rise and pathetically plead for help. The toilers were mocked in their writhing, were insolently told that they were in their right place and ought to be kept there, that their misery was the reaping of their own sowing, that the curse of poverty was proof that they were the devil's poor; and in keeping with this spirit every obstacle was placed in their way as they attempted to better their condition. As they, solitary and despairing, struggled amid the engulfing waves, the elegant cabin passengers of splendid steamers shouted merrily to them, "Help yourselves," and continued their pleasure excursion, without lowering a boat or throwing to the sinking mortals a rope or life preserver.

This is horrible, and the horror is being realized. The priest and Levite pass by; the good Samaritan has not come in the shape of wealth and scholarship. And religion? Men who know the facts are appalled at the treatment which, in many places, the toiling masses receive from the church. Now that the social democracy spurns the church, men in Germany express astonishment that not till near the middle of this century did the church begin to appreciate that it has an especial mission to the poorer classes. Then Wichern directed attention to this important field of Christian love and labor, and then the great modern work of "Inner Mission" began in the fatherland. The discovery has been made that in our best Christian lands there are neglected and abandoned masses, and that at home as well as in Africa there are heathen who sadly need enlightenment and conversion. A few only have as yet learned the lesson taught theoretically and practically by Wichern. The treatment to which laborers have been subject has not only embittered them, but in many instances led them to hate the church. If now it turns in the spirit

of helpfulness toward them, they declare that this is not because it loves them, but because the church is anxious to save itself and to regain its lost prestige.

Co-operation of Forces.

These general considerations respecting the solution of our problem show that the difficulties are increased by the false treatment to which it is subjected. The student is especially to be warned against such an isolation of social factors as attributes to the efficiency of one what can be accomplished only by a co-operation of all the factors. Mentally we can abstract intellectual, moral, and industrial agencies ; but in real life they are united and co-operative. Social progress must be apprehended as the product of all the regenerative and reformatory elements of society. Some factors are perhaps more prominent than the rest, but all act, and each depends on the co-operation of the others for efficiency. This is as true of society as in the case of the individual. Yet it is constantly overlooked. We take a single illustration from a multitute. A writer says : " Economic reform must precede moral reform. A good living must be assured to all industrious men before they can be cured of dishonesty and the practice of injustice. It is useless to preach to distressed people. First give them a chance to supply their needs, then educate them ; for necessity knows no law."

Now, nothing is better established than that economic and moral reform ought to be co-operative. In many cases moral reform would be followed by economic reform. To a large number of persons " a good living " will be possible only if they comply with ethical conditions. Without co-operation both economic and moral reform may fail, but with co-operation both will be strengthened and both may prove successful. Each social power is to be put in its

proper place, which means that it is to be rightly co ordinated with all the rest.

But so many questions arise in connection with the solution of the Social Problem that but a fraction of them can be considered, and so many factors are involved that we may well despair of putting each in its right place and giving it due weight. These factors are so interlaced and their interaction is so close that they cannot be separated. What belongs to the individual, what to society? How much shall be left to each individual to control, and what functions are social? What shall the state do, and what voluntary organization? When we come to ethics we find fundamental principles in dispute, to say nothing of the unsettled boundaries between personal and social ethics. In sociology, which is involved in every step we take, we can hardly claim to have more than tentative beginnings. Political economy, on which so many inquirers lay the main stress, is in a transition state. Many of the old doctrines are in dispute, others are rejected, and the new political economy is in an unsettled condition, with numerous doubtful points. In economies we must not only distinguish between the permanent and the variable elements, but likewise between the social stages and conditions to which the variable elements are adapted. The question also arises how far economic laws are to be superseded by ethical considerations. The ethics of high profits and starvation wages may conflict with the economics of the same. We must also distinguish between a general economic law and its application to individual cases. The industries cannot flourish if the laborers are degraded; but that does not prevent the degradation of laborers in individual instances. Not only must the multiplicity of the co-opera-

tive factors be considered, but likewise the limitation and augmentation to which each is subjected by its interaction with others.

Christian Socialism.

In a later chapter we shall have an opportunity to discuss the relation of the church to the solution. Here our aim is to get those views which are of a preliminary character, and to remove such objections as interfere with the fair and full investigation of the subject. As a barrier in the way of the best inquiry we regard the attempt to solve the problem from an exclusive, professional, or narrow specialist's standpoint. The lawyer emphasizes legal enactments, the politician considers especially the governmental aspect of the case, and the churchman regards the church as the chief, if not sole, factor in the solution. Society is fortunate if each does not insist on some patent or intuitional method for disposing of the whole matter. Some Christians advocate a Christian socialism as the cure of social ills. In that case socialism cannot be taken as a particular form of industrial collectivism, for that is not established by Christianity. The spirit of Christ ought undoubtedly to be supreme in the economic relations of men; but more than this spirit is required in order to determine the best mode of production and of distribution. With the dominance of that spirit the selfishness and cupidity and injustice and brutality, now so common in business relations, would be impossible, and the social question as it now confronts us could not exist; but there might be others of an economic and political character. Such questions as those of private and communal property, of individualism and socialism, of the relative value of different kinds of labor, of the relation between capital and labor, of the tenure of land, of rent, interest, and profit, and many others respecting utility, must be settled on economic principles, in part at least; and so far as

purely economic they no more affect Christianity than does a question in mathematics. Much of the religious as well as intellectual progress of modern times is due to the fact that divinity occupies a more appropriate place among the sciences than in the Middle Ages, when it was the only science or at least domineered over all the sciences. Those who make Christ the divider of goods among men, which He refused to be, are in danger of losing the essence of Christianity.

If theology is to be kept it its place, it must be kept out of places where it does not belong. Let the most exalted place be given to religion; but it cannot by itself solve the Social Problem. On the continent of Europe, where the problem has been so fully developed, this is admitted and theologians treat it as self-evident. In different European countries Christian Social Congresses are held in which preachers and theologians are active; but much prominence is likewise given to specialists in agriculture and manufactures, to statesmen and economists, the aim being to get all possible light on the subject and to bring about a co-operation of all the social forces. But as an application of the spirit and teachings of Christ to social affairs Christian socialism has a very important place.

Temporary Relief and Actual Remedy.

Relief of immediate necessities in an emergency must not be taken for a solution of the Social Problem. The most imperative duty for an individual and community is the removal of actual suffering. The poor must be provided for, the sick nursed, the slums abolished, temperance promoted, employment found for the unemployed, and especial attention should be paid to working women and children. The work of churches, of benevolent societies, and of communities, in respect to the Social Problem, is now confined chiefly to

such undertakings. The study of charities is putting charity organizations on a better working basis so as to relieve misery without promoting pauperism. The value of these benevolent enterprises cannot be overestimated, unless they be regarded as an actual solution of our problem. Those who see no other problem than is solved by this charitable work, are an illustration of the shallow treatment to which our theme is subject. The problem is actually missed if the effort at human welfare goes no deeper than to relieve distress in an emergency.

The question in our problem is not so much how to provide for paupers, as how to get rid of paupers, how to make pauperism unnecessary and impossible. It is far more important to establish a condition in which there shall be no unemployed than to secure employment for such as are temporarily without work. The best method of arbitration is in demand; but still more urgent is the demand for such a relation of employers and employed as shall remove occasion and cause for antagonism and strikes. When a financial crisis comes, the energies of the public are concentrated on meeting the peculiar demands made by the hard times; but the solution of the Social Problem means that such crises themselves shall be avoided.

This brings the aim definitely before us; not expedients, not temporary relief in emergencies is the ultimate aim, but an actual cure, the removal of the causes of ills, a system so healthy as to need no remedies, because there are no diseases. How far this aim can be realized must be determined by investigation and progress. It is, however, clear that this presents an aim very different from the usual one, and that it makes the work of the solution far more deep and more radical than is generally supposed.

The Desirable and the Possible.

Numerous descriptions of a desirable social condition have been given; but is the desirable also possible? Crises and times of fermentation are the periods when the destructive forces are most potent, and when hopes, also, are most sanguine. Wicliffe, Huss, Luther, the French revolution, and other epochs in history excited hopes, particularly in the minds of the masses, which were destined to disappointment. In the present crisis ideals are presented as if attainable by a mere change of external conditions. The intensity of desire becomes the creator of extravagant expectations. This makes it essential to consider what is possible in human progress, as well as what is desirable. Men who might be a power when working within the realm of possibility, not only wear out their energies in vain while fighting the inevitable, but also neglect what is useful and at the same time attainable. Certain ills may be incidental to the very nature of things, or our ignorance may put insuperable difficulties in the way of their removal. We cannot avert death; there are diseases whose causes and remedies are not within our power; numerous evils in the social organism are imperfectly understood, we have not even their diagnosis, still less their cure. There are practical as well as theoretical difficulties, so that every social worker meets painful limitations. However deep and broad his knowledge, and whatever personal perfection he may have attained, he cannot control the opinions, the ideals, the character, and the actions of his fellow men. The reformer deeply conscious of the needs of his age may have to create in others a consciousness of these needs before his very efforts in their behalf receive attention. Men may want what they do not need, but they may also need what they do not want. Both in Europe and America labor leaders have found it

difficult to arouse laborers, particularly the most oppressed and most degraded, to a consideration of their own interests, and to unite them for the furtherance of the same. The toilers may be subjected till subjection seems to them their normal sphere. Whatever equality may be desirable, we have seen that perfect equality is out of the question.

Delusions.

With a bound labor has leaped forward as if suddenly made aware of its importance, its needs, its power, its rights, and its destiny. It is endowed with the vigor, the aspirations, the ideals, and the hopes of youth. In the midst of the most thorough realism many laborers have at once become idealists. Where the sociological student beholds a series of complicated causes and finds many phenomena involved in mystery, they find the interpretation in the one word capitalism, or competition, or some other term whose meaning may be obscure. The remedy they propose is as simple as the cause, and its application seems as easy as it is simple. They know only their own condition and cannot judge of any other; yet they profess to know just what would happen if certain untried changes were introduced. Like Fourier, some professed leaders of laborers propose to do away with the irksomeness of toil, leaving only sport; they preach the millennium of labor and enchant their followers with visions. This we may be sure of: in every state of society there will be inequalities, conflicts, weakness, suffering, and failures. When delusions are spread for the sake of breeding discontent among laborers and robbing them of the benefits within their reach, the process is despicable. The true friend of labor seeks to banish such false hopes by insisting on a pursuit of the desirable so far as limited by the possible. Perhaps much more of the desirable is attainable than we think; future progress may make possible what is not so at present. Who in the mid-

dle of last century could have believed in our present power of steam and electricity? There is a constant enlargement of the realm of social possibility.

But if overestimation and underestimation are both to be avoided we must not lose ourselves in goals distant, but must stand firmly on the existing realism, then move forward step by step, turning possibility into actuality as opportunity occurs. Never is the permanent cure for ills to be lost sight of; but as we move toward the permanent cure, let us seize every temporary relief within reach. While social ideals are cherished the social actuality must likewise be contemplated. Progress towards the ideals may not be in a direct line, but spirally, subject even to retrogressive movements. Modestly, hopefully, but without fanaticism, the actual situation must always be the ground on which we work; and in constant touch with the actuality and in its development the condition of success must be sought.

There is abundant reason for this modesty. History reveals the various means adopted to secure social equality and gives the results of the various experiments; from these we learn that neither Greece, nor Rome, nor the church has solved the problem. The ablest thinkers, the most devoted workers, and the best institutions have not been able to meet the demands now made. Well may we pause when social specialists admit that they have not even the theory for realizing the just claims of workingmen. There is no consensus respecting any system of social reform; one reformer opposes what another favors; frequently the same specialist passes from one remedial agency to another, now regarding as efficient what is later rejected as ineffective. All follow the lead of the desirable in hope of discovering what is possible. Is not the mission of humanity a growth toward perfection rather than its final possession and rest in its attainment?

Hope.

Many a social student can appreciate the feeling of Sismondi, who sympathized deeply with laborers and saw what was just, but confessed his inability to introduce that justice into practice. This is totally different from that indifferent spirit which flippantly dismisses the whole matter as involved in inextricable difficulty, but never thinks of seriously inquiring into the subject. There is also a very bright side to our problem. Who a century ago or just before the French rovolution could have imagined it possible for the European laborers to make the advance attained at the close of the nineteenth century? Even before 1848 such progress seemed out of the question. Since the factory laws and the introduction of Trade Unions the labor world in England has been transformed. And when we consider the vast strides made in the condition of laborers in the United States since the revolution; when we behold their awakening, their determination to make further advances, their study of the questions which most deeply concern them, and the zeal of students and workers from the other classes who make the cause of workingmen their own and rally to their support, there is much ground for hope. All may not be attained that is desired, but much, very much can be attained. Where perfect cure is impossible permanent amelioration may be within reach.

We may reasonably expect the solution itself and the hope of solution to be cumulative. With the existing apathy of large numbers respecting the problem we cannot conceive what the situation will be when the entire community is aroused on the subject and regards the solution as its own affair. The rapid advance of social science must diffuse social ideas and aid in establishing right social relations. The trend in thought and feeling indicates that individual selfishness will more and more be obliged to yield

to that good-will toward others which the philosopher Lotze puts at the basis of ethics. The great achievements in social work are prophetic of still greater results. The social ideas, social efforts, social achievements, and social hope must co-operate for the cumulative development of the solution.

Literature.

On the solution of the Social Problem the lack of comprehensive, systematic, and thorough discussion is painfully apparent. Various socialistic solutions will be considered in the following chapters. Numerous works treat of particular ills and their removal. Economic, political, ethical, and Christian remedies are proposed by writers of these different departments of thought. There is, however, need of literature which weighs and co-ordinates all the social forces and which concentrates their operation on permanent cure, not merely on relief of temporary emergencies. Of especial value are the writings of such economists as correlate their specialty with ethics, political science, and sociology. The works of Lange and Contzen, already mentioned, discuss the solution, and Ely's "Socialism and Social Reform," Part IV., is on The Golden Mean, or Practicable Social Reform. "Social Peace," by Schulze-Gaevernitz, Scribner's Sons, discusses the subject chiefly from the side of labor organizations.

CHAPTER VI.

SOLUTION BY REVOLUTION.

COMMUNISM. THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY. ANARCHISM.

The Alternative.

The impartial students of the situation, to whatever country they may belong, are essentially unanimous on one subject: a social change is inevitable. The elemental forces in human nature which struggle to attain well-being have been aroused and developed in the laboring classes, and who will or can check their working? The greatest injustice and violence would be necessary to rob these classes of their enlightenment, their ideals so far as worthy, and of their aspiration to realize them. They must themselves be degraded in order to be satisfied with a degraded position, and they will have to be brutalized in order to overcome their ambition to rise. No humane being will tolerate the suggestion that their noble progress is in any way to be interfered with; no Christian community can submit to the outrage which by overwork and underpay, by the curse of the saloon or by debauching pleasure, aims to deprive them of agitation and to rob them of their manhood; and laborers would indignantly rise *en masse* against the diabolical purpose to keep them down. We are too much inclined to think that a degree of civilization has been attained which makes general the desire that the situation of laborers be improved. This is a mistake. Large numbers in every community are wholly indifferent and do not give the matter a thought; some ridicule such as earnestly labor for this improvement; and there are others whose

selfish interest leads them to put obstacles in the way of the elevation of the toilers. In many a mind the superiority and inferiority of men are determined by the classes to which they belong.

The author was told by a European employer of laborers that the difficulty with them is that they are too well educated. Ignorance would therefore be the remedy for present agitation. Working-women especially, he thought, ought to be more limited in education. If they knew how to keep accounts and rear children their knowledge would be sufficient. A Continental writer claims that an entire class finds in limiting the enlightenment of the masses the solution of the Social Problem. Discontent may be fiendish, but it may also be divine; if it did not exist there might be imperative moral reasons for creating it. No mission is more evident or more urgent than the intellectual, moral, and social development of workingmen and their families; but this will be a spur to their ambition, will enlarge their wants and intensify their unrest. The enlarged demands must be met; but with the present condition and methods this is impossible. The feeling is too intense and the interests involved are too momentous to dismiss the matter with the statement that we must have hewers of wood and drawers of water, that there is hard and dirty work and some must be detailed to do it. The laborers want to know why it falls to their lot to occupy this position, whether some relief is not possible by means of a more equitable distribution of the toil, and whether it would not be well for the classes occasionally to change places. If there is to be no privileged class, is there to be, what is still worse, an unprivileged one? The problem becomes more perplexing when men insist on living like men, and then interpret this to mean that they are the

divine image, and that life ought to be worthy of this image.

The consensus practically attained among students that change is inevitable is of the utmost importance. In this respect they stand as one man, and prophets, reformers, philanthropists, and Christian workers stand with them. Leading economists, particularly in Germany, admit the necessity of change. This is by no means in the interest of extreme socialism, for that is usually opposed by them. Graham, himself a professor of political economy, claims that the "injustice of the existing system is conceded," and says: "The present system, industrial and social, the Socialists say, is organized injustice, which results in injustice in all directions, gross and palpable. And the remarkable thing is that they have all but gained over, or are gaining over, the economists to their view, both in England and in Germany. Mill, for example, in his 'Political Economy,' constantly declaims against the injustice involved in the present distribution of wealth, and he repeats his denunciation in his 'Autobiography.' Cairnes, in his last book, has discovered that the results of the existing industrial system 'are not easily reconcilable with any standard of right generally accepted among men' . . .; while Professor Sedgwick, eminent as a writer on morals as well as economics, goes so far as to say, 'If the former method (the Socialist's) of providing for the progress of industry could be trusted to work without any counterbalancing drawbacks, the perpetuation of the inequalities of distribution that we see to be inevitably bound up with the existing system would be difficult to reconcile with our common sense of justice.'" * Schæffle, Wagner, Schmoller, Brentano, and many other eminent economists of Germany are still more emphatic and

* "Socialism New and Old," Introduction.

explicit in their condemnation. But while socialists and others insist on change their paths diverge so soon as the question is asked: What shall the change be? Two answers are possible. The present social order must be revolutionized so as to inaugurate a totally different system with new principles, or else the existing system must be so developed as to remove unjust inequalities and satisfy the reasonable demands of all members of the social organism. In other words, the only alternative is *Revolution* or *Evolution.*

Revolution.

In this chapter we take up for consideration the first of these alternatives. A large number of persons despair with respect to the possibility of so remedying the present industrial and social system as to adapt it to the exigencies of the demands made by the laborers. They declare that it is so hopelessly corrupt as to be beyond reformation; hence total destruction is the only way to get rid of its total depravity. Large masses of laborers under the influence of the social democracy persistently oppose all efforts at reform which aim to make the present order tolerable and finally satisfactory. Such efforts are denounced as calculated to deceive the masses without relieving them, and to prevent them from inaugurating that revolution which alone can introduce the needed changes. The revolutionary, as much as the absolutely conservative, faction is also a dogmatic party. They no longer inquire into the character of the present system and its adaptability, they do not even discriminate between its valuable and its pernicious features, but summarily condemn it as a totality. The tendency is strong in criticism and merciless in the exposure of ills. It treats its presuppositions as axioms, and pursues dogmatically a course fixed dogmatically.

In continental Europe it is common at the meetings of

laborers to dwell on the sufferings of the laboring classes and to make the existing social arrangement responsible for their miseries. In a large meeting of the unemployed in Berlin the present method of production was denounced as the cause of the social inequalities; but while the speakers blamed society for letting laborers and their families starve, not a word was said about the need of change in laborers themselves, the bottle was passing rapidly from mouth to mouth, and waiters were busy selling intoxicating drinks. When a capitalist mistreats his laborers or gives stingy wages, the cry is at once raised that this is due to the system itself. One of the most common methods resorted to employs all possible means to make the laborer dissatisfied with his condition, and then incites him to shatter the existing social fabric. Legislation which might make the toilers more content with their lot is either opposed, or accepted with the explanation that all possible advantage is to be gotten from it, but that it can under no circumstances be regarded as a recommendation of the existing system. In some cases the efforts of laborers to be economical and to save for future emergencies is opposed, lest it might reconcile them to the present industrial order. Discontent is fostered because it prepares the way for revolution.

The Aim of Revolution.

Revolution aims at a change of principles. It wants to get rid of the foundation as well as of the superstructure of our present industries. The main objection to the existing system is that the distribution is not equitable; but in order to make a more equitable distribution of the burdens and the products of toil, it is held that the mode of production must likewise be changed. But by revolutionizing the economic system the whole fabric of the existing society will be destroyed. The present division

into classes is to cease, especially the striking contrast between capitalists and laborers. It is claimed that the system known as capitalism, individualism, liberalism, competition, and the Manchester School, is radically wrong in that it subjects laborers and virtually enslaves them. The weak are said to be at the mercy of the strong; the unscrupulous take advantage of the honest and upright; fortuitous circumstances and uncalculable accident often nullify the advantages of foresight and enterprise; and energy and prudence and merit have no fair chance, because the conditions of the race are not just. Therefore the demand is made unconditionally that the system itself be totally destroyed and a new beginning made.

Individual Action.

The thoughtful and the most just among the leaders of the revolutionary movements distinguish between the system and the individuals who act under it. They say that the system itself is chiefly to blame for the evils that prevail. A capitalist may of course be unnecessarily cruel; but as the system itself is individualistic and selfish, there are many evils which are unavoidable, no matter how upright the individual employer. These revolutionists admit that if they were capitalists they would now be obliged to conduct their business on the principles of individualism and competition; they could not otherwise be successful in the inevitable conflict. Singer of Berlin, the millionaire, a leader of the social democrats, adapts himself in his employment of laborers and in his industrial relations to the conditions of the present economic system. His fellow social democrats do not blame him for this, because they admit that business could not now be conducted successfully on other principles. But the fact that the blame is thrown on capitalism and not on the individual capitalist, makes them the more determined to overthrow the reign of capitalism.

The Corruption of Society.

The charges against the industrial system are not, however, regarded as an apology for the character of the existing society. That, too, is pronounced so corrupt as to be fit only for destruction. This fact is regarded as unquestionable, whether the system be to blame for it or not. The laborers are taught that self-help is their only hope, privilege, wealth and scholarship being unable to appreciate the situation of laborers, and unwilling to enter heartily with them into efficient efforts to secure relief. The church is denounced as favoring the privileged classes, and as being essentially conservative and therefore in the way of the proposed revolution.

A few years ago a congress was held in the city of Berlin to discuss socialism and the means to meet its demands. Eminent theologians were among the speakers, and the audience of six hundred consisted chiefly of preachers and theological students. As has become usual in such cases, the laborers had no faith that the church was now really concerned for them, but attributed the whole movement to selfishness. This is the comment of a social democratic journal on the meeting: "The preachers realize that the water has come up to their throats, they feel the ground shaking under their feet, and they are trying to save themselves." The state no less than the church is opposed, because pledged to maintain the existing order and thought to be under the control of the dominant or capitalistic class.

Despair and Revolution.

It is thus evident that men despair of the present system and therefore look upon revolution as the only hope. An instructive instance in this respect is the case of Mr. Singer, mentioned above. It is said that as an extensive manufacturer he had compassion on his workingmen

and wanted to improve their condition. But he thought that manufacturers ought to co-operate in the matter; there would be but little relief if one acted alone, and by raising the wages while others did not he would be put at a disadvantage in the competitive race. In consulting other capitalists he met with little favor. They wanted to manage their business in their own way, seeking the largest profit and therefore the cheapest labor. But there was another difficulty: if in one city or country wages are increased without making the increase general or international, those who do not increase wages might undersell the rest and drive them out of the market. It thus became clear to him that both the system and the capitalists are to blame for the present unfavorable condition, and that the remedy is in revolution. Even among those who oppose the revolutionary tendency there are some who despair of the present trend. Rudolph Meyer has written one of the best books on socialism, with the title: "The Struggle of the Fourth Estate for Emancipation." In the second edition he calls attention to the fact that in the first he had expressed the hope that the other classes might be aroused to study the situation and consider their duty to the laboring masses, and by meeting the just demands of the toilers check the revolution. But now he has given up that hope and sees no evidence that the revolutionary tendencies will be checked. Others have similar fears. They behold in the apathy of the favored classes, in their selfish greed, their love of pleasure, and in their determination to perpetuate their advantages a proof that society is not willing seriously to consider its duties, much less to enter earnestly on their performance. Some who advocate reform admit that it ought to come very speedily, otherwise the revolution will get so far in advance that it cannot be overtaken by reform.

Sign of the Times.

Not only are the revolutionary movements significant in themselves and an interesting study, but they are also a most important revelation of the age. Former ages had local revolts, sudden outbreaks and revolutions. This was often the case in Greece and Rome, in the Middle Ages, in the Peasant War of 1525, in France at the close of last century, and repeatedly in Europe since that time. But now discontent is chronic, antagonism to capital organized, revolution has become a system, this system has advocates in all the advanced nations, they already number millions and are on the increase. It is not merely a local but an international movement; it is not hasty, but calm, resolute, persistent, and cumulative. Nothing like it has ever appeared in history. And those who see most deeply behold in it an embodiment of many of the most dominant forces of the times.

Characteristics of the Movements.

Two of the revolutionary movements make private capital the centre of attack, namely, Communism and the Social Democracy. They regard private capital as an unjust monopoly, as robbing some in proportion as it benefits others, and as the source of the gross injustice and fearful evils of the present. Hence they aim at its destruction so as to make universal the benefits now confined to a few. As the monopoly in government and education has ceased, so, they hold, the monopoly in capital must end. Anarchism also aims at a complete industrial change; but the centre of its attack is the state itself, not merely the existing state.

Socialism.

Before we discuss the leading revolutionary tendencies the term socialism, so often used to cover all these tendencies, ought to be defined. It is said to have been first used in England, in

1835, in connection with the efforts of Richard Owen to better the condition of the laborers; but it was through French writers that its use became general. Now the term is employed so vaguely that it requires definition in order to give its meaning exactness. It was introduced as the opposite of individualism, and in its most general sense designates a socializing tendency in distinction from the prevalent individualistic spirit. Socialism thus includes whatever tends to improve the condition of society, and in this altruistic sense whoever seeks human welfare is a socialist. In 1848 Proudhon was asked by a magistrate who was examining him, What is socialism? His answer was, "It is every aspiration toward the improvement of society." The justice said, "But in that case we are all socialists." "That is exactly what I think," rejoined Proudhon.* This is a fair sample of the vague and general sense still common in our day. Careful writers, however, use the word in a more limited sense. They designate by means of it some form of collectivism, the control of certain objects of interest by the public instead of individuals, such as telephones, water and gas works, street cars, by the municipality, telegraphs and railroads by the state or nation.

In this technical sense socialism includes communism as the most extreme form of socialization. When Marx and Engles issued the Manifesto which contains the principles of the social democracy, they called it the "Communistic Manifesto." For definiteness it is, however, advisable to confine communism to that form of socialism which aims to hold all possessions in common. The degrees of socialization expressed by socialism vary greatly. Some are inclined to regard as socialistic every act of the state which is intended to regulate or further the industries, such as a

* Laveleye, "Socialism of To-Day," Introduction.

tariff or laws to protect laborers. The possible forms of collectivism vary greatly. Thus the land can be made social instead of individual property while the industries remain under private control, or the land can continue in private hands while the industries are socialized, or a few industries can be made social, such, namely, as tend to become monopolies.

In its most general sense socialism is necessary; society cannot exist without having some things common. The question, however, is what shall be socialized and how much society is to hold in common. Thus it is possible that there may be a beneficial as well as a pernicious socialism. The degree of socialization and individualization is the subject of controversy. There are socialists and socialists. Among different parties and in different countries socialism has a variety of meanings. The dominant socialistic tendency in a land usually determines the sense in which socialism is used in that land. The social democracy is the strongest socialistic party in Germany; hence that is usually meant by German socialism. But there are in Germany also Evangelical socialists, Catholic socialists, and socialists of the chair. In England the Fabian Society is apt to be regarded as the standard of socialism. In the Latin countries socialism is often used to designate all revolutionary tendencies, anarchism included. In the United States the term is used so vaguely, often so ignorantly, that a conscientious man may well refuse to affirm or deny that he is a socialist, unless the sense in which socialism is used be defined.

1. Communism.

Some kind of a communistic state has been the dream of numerous social reformers from Plato to our own day. The theory of communism holds that the rights of men are essentially equal, and that the gifts of nature ought to be

equally accessible to all. In order to make the industrial and social equality harmonize with that of nature, it is proposed to establish a community of goods and interests; that is, to put all the members of the community on an equal footing respecting duties and rewards. All able bodied persons must labor; the product of the labor belongs to the community; and each one receives according to his needs. This communism is the extreme opposite of an extreme individualism. Sometimes it has a religious basis, as the community of goods mentioned Acts ii., and in the case of the Shakers and other societies; its chief aim is, however, economic and social.

Limits to Communism.

Some dreamers have favored communism on account of the supposed equality it promotes among men. It may well be questioned whether the theory does not rest on an undue emphasis of external conditions to the neglect of individual peculiarities. The widely-prevalent theory that the circumstances of men need but be improved in order to improve their character, is proved false by numerous examples; and there seems to be no more reason for the theory that equal external conditions will make men equal. Bread and water are more to one man than a feast is to another; poets have found greater contentment and happiness in cottages than in palaces. The abilities, the appreciation, the needs of men are not equal. Most people who enter a fair are struck by the many objects which they covet; but Socrates enters a fair and exclaims, "How many things there are which I do not need." Diogenes wants a tub, Alexander wants more worlds to conquer. Equal conditions would in many cases increase the actual inequalities of men. Hence we find that different communistic ideals prevail. While modern communists emphasize equality, some of the earlier ones laid more stress on the

differences in men themselves. Thus Plato wanted his communistic state to consist of three distinct classes, the ruling class, the soldiers, and the laborers.

Besides the difficulty in communism of giving to each his dues and what is adapted to his peculiarity, there is necessarily a limit to the objects held in common. Some things are personal and cannot be shared. Over his soul and body the individual has a greater control than any one else. The labor a man performs is his own, and in some measure his personal peculiarity will be impressed on it and embodied in it. His food he cannot share and his clothing must be his own. But aside from the natural limitations there may be others. Some communists advocate free love, others reject it. Plato and others wanted the state to be the ward of all the children, which would involve the destruction of family life. It is thus evident that every communistic society must be judged by the degree and character of the communism which it adopts.

Existing Communism.

In some form and degree, as we have seen, communism prevails in all society. Were not some things common there would be no bonds of union, no basis on which to stand. Thus the laws, the government, the institutions, and the schools of the land are common to all. One of the most important problems of the day is the development of the existing communism. This is one of the points around which the industrial and political conflicts centre. Are there not objects which are now left to individual enterprise or to corporations which ought to be socialized by becoming communal or national? This question will be discussed later. There is likewise a strong communistic element in the family, in various organizations, in sisterhoods, brotherhoods, and other religious orders. In Catholicism the communistic elements are marked, while in Protestantism

the individualistic factor has been more developed. In numerous departments of life communism is far more extensive than is usually supposed, and there is room for its still greater prevalence. Besides this extension of a limited community of interests and goods, it may be found advisable to increase the number of distinctly communistic societies. But they ought to be voluntary. The state allows them, society puts no obstacle in their way, and there is opportunity for valuable experiments. Some of the communistic societies in the United States have attained an encouraging degree of material success. If congenial spirits can live together with common possessions, common toil, and common products of toil, they may find this system most advantageous.

Enforced Communism.

This voluntary communism differs greatly, however, from a communism forced on all and made the absolute law of the national life. If those who advocate this are really in earnest, why do they not inaugurate communistic associations on a large scale and prove their scheme practicable? There would be more reason in this than in dreamy theories which remain untried and in the effort to force unwilling ones to adopt their scheme. It would be difficult to invent a worse kind of tyranny than that which necessitates all persons, whether congenial or not, to be most intimate with one another and to hold their possessions in common. Those who have a strong personality and a developed individuality insist on some choice in the matter. The theory is based on an equality which does not exist and cannot be established, and attempts to accomplish by force what should be left to preference and choice. Life is variety and its completeness is diversity in unity; and when that life is vigorous, it cannot move along that dead

level of monotony which seems inevitable in an enforced national communism.

The system commends itself especially to the weak who want the level of their attainment to be the standard for all. Would not those who rise above the vulgar standard trespass on communism? A mountain would be a crime, a molehill an unnatural upheavel. It would be an intolerable hardship to oblige those who rise above the rest through inherent power or personal effort to be forced to the same lot with the weak. Not only would this be unjust, but it would also destroy ambition and curb the aspiration to rise. It is no wonder that the strong young men are especially tempted to withdraw from communistic societies; they want more room, more inspiration, greater opportunities. Even when communism is industrially successful and affords a good assurance society for its members, it furnishes too little attraction for energetic, enterprising, and original minds. It is not natural, but a mechanism; and the number of persons who fit into its mechanism is limited. These reasons sufficiently explain the fact that extreme communistic theories find comparatively few advocates in our day.

2. The Social Democracy.

No other revolutionary movement can even remotely be compared in importance with the social democracy. It has a definite aim, the socialistic state; it promises to dignify labor, to make it the corner stone of that state, to elevate the laborer, and to establish the reign of social justice; its organization is marvelously perfect, its success has been phenomenal, and it inspires in laborers the strongest hope of final victory. These are the qualities which have made it so powerful in Germany and its influence so contagious in other countries; not only in its German home, but also in Belgium, France, Italy, Switzer-

land, Holland, Scandinavia, England, and the United States its power and number of adherents seem to be on the increase. While other social movements are confused, doubtful and merely tentative, the social democracy presents something tangible, creates confidence, and thus gains the ascendancy over indefinite and vascillating tendencies and promises to absorb them. The position of this party is consequently of first importance for understanding the revolutionary trend of our day.

The Problem to be Solved.

We cannot recapitulate the origin and various stages of progress in the history of the social democracy, the pioneer work in the agitations of Ferdinand Lassalle, the exposure of the condition of the laboring classes, particularly in England, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, and the efforts of many others to prepare the laborers for action. In the Old World with its hereditary ranks, with a sharp distinction of the various classes, with the privileges severely limited, and with the opportunites to rise from one social grade to another reduced to a minimum, the effort to awaken the masses and make them rebel against their subjection was beset with peculiar difficulties. The traditions, the laws, the governments, the institutions, the dominant power of privilege and wealth, all combined to keep them down. Yet this was not the worst phase of the situation. The condition to which the laborers had been reduced was the most hopeless feature. Their long degradation had degraded them and made that degradation seem natural, and to it their whole being was adapted. The task first of all necessary for a while appeared almost impossible, namely, to arouse the masses, to induce them to study their condition and to make them conscious of their needs, to unite them for self-help, and to convince

them that their subjection is neither just nor inevitable. They had to be changed in order to attempt a change.

After the preparatory task of arousing them it was necessary to give a definite statement of the course to be pursued for their emancipation. This was done most clearly by Marx, the intellectual leader of the movement. To the philosophical training in the school of Hegel and to an extensive study of the condition of capital and labor on the Continent and in England he added an investigation of the various theories of political economy, especially those of Adam Smith and David Ricardo and their English followers. Besides his effect on the labor movement he also exerted a powerful influence on the recent development in economic science. We must look to economics for the basis of his discussion and for the essential factors in his influence. He concentrated the attention on the material interests of laborers and made the improvement of their economic condition the aim of his life. As a materialist he emphasized this condition and the external environment; and this one-sided emphasis reveals his strength as well as his limitation. Abstracting the theory usually ascribed to Ricardo, that labor is the source of all exchange value, the problem was this: how can all value go to labor? For decades political economy has been especially intent on determining the true source of value. The view so common among the social democrats and laborers generally that manual labor is the producing cause of all value, is certainly false. All the factors which enter into production, of which manual labor is but one, are the producing causes. But by making labor the sole producer the problem is as stated above: how will it be possible to give to laborers the total value, or, which is the same thing, the total product, of labor? This can be done only by destroying every unearned increment in the form of rent, profit,

and interest, which are declared to be robbery, the result of exploiting laborers for the purpose of enriching the capitalists.

The Historic Law of Marx.

At the close of his first volume on "Capital" Karl Marx gives his view on "the historic tendency of capitalistic accumulation." He holds that the modern system of production and distribution tends inevitably to self-destruction. The laborers are robbed of the product of their toil by the capitalists; these capitalists compete among themselves and devour one another; monopolies are created which drive the smaller establishments out of the market and concentrate the wealth in a few hands; the middle class disappears, and on the one hand we have a few who are very rich, and on the other the masses who are doomed to toil and enslavement and poverty. "The immediate producers of all value are exploited with the most reckless vandalism and under the influence of the most infamous, the most despicable, and the most hateful of all passions." This process will continue to unfold the iniquities inherent in the present system until the situation becomes intolerable; then "the hour of the capitalistic private property strikes. The expropriators are expropriated," which means that the robbers are robbed. All this works with the force and with the inevitable necessity of a natural law. Efforts to check the development will only further it. While the theory that the laborers are regularly, systematically robbed of their earnings, in order to enrich still more the rich, serves to embitter them to the utmost, the element of despair is produced by the existing system through the conviction that their condition must constantly grow worse.

The *Communistic Manifesto* of Marx and Engels, which appeared in 1847, says that as industry advances the mod-

ern laborer constantly sinks more and more. "The laborer becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth." This the laborers will try to resist by revolutionary associations. In the process of development the basis of capitalism will be undermined. The existing industrial system "will above all else produce its own grave-diggers. Its destruction and the victory of the proletariat are equally unavoidable." One need but turn to the article of Liebknecht on "The Programme of German Socialism," in the Forum, February, 1895, in order to see how this theory is used by the social democracy in our day. By producing the conviction that the movement *must* succeed, the unflinching devotion and enthusiastic zeal of laborers are assured. Even if the prevision is mistaken and the prophecy false, they have all the effect of a true prediction on devout believers. Liebknecht attributes the growth of the social democracy to the "logic of facts." Since fate does everything, "persons have nothing to do with it." He declares that socialism is beyond the reach of the rulers. "Socialism is a necessity. And necessity knows no law." If heretofore the social democracy has moved forward with an irresistible force, it is largely due to this element of fate which has been incorporated in the convictions of those who are in the movement.

While the very development of capitalism is thus represented as a process which digs the grave of the present social order, unusual events will greatly hasten the destruction. Calamities themselves are the harbingers of hope. "Sooner or later," says a social democratic journal, "epidemics or war must produce havoc throughout Europe. Then the cry of the poor, hitherto unheeded, will be changed into an appeal for vengeance that will cause the great and mighty to turn pale. Then the hour of judg-

ment will strike the hour of redemption." Indeed, if the revolutionary press is to be believed, the eagles are already gathering to devour the carcass.

All Productive Capital Made Social.

The remedy proposed by Marx is the goal to which his historic law tends. The laborer never can get the total product of his labor so long as the productive capital continues in private hands. Capitalism means dominion, and this will be used as the means for enslaving and robbing the laborer. The remedy consists in changing all *private, productive and competing capital into communal or state capital.* Thus so far as all production is concerned the community or state is to be the only capitalist. The "Communistic Manifesto" declares that capital is the product of the common activity of many members of the community or of the labor of the totality. "Therefore capital is not a personal but a social power. If therefore capital is made common, being changed into property which belongs to all the members of society, then *personal* property is not made social." Society simply makes social what in its nature is already social, but has been falsely appropriated for private purposes.

The "Programme of the Social Democracy of Germany," adopted at Erfurt in 1891, and still the basis of the party, says: "Private property in the means of production, which property was formerly the means for securing to the producer the possession of his product, has now become the means of robbing peasants, manual laborers, and small tradesmen, and of putting those who do not labor, namely, capitalists and large landowners, into possession of the product of the laborer. Only by changing the capitalistic private possession of the means of production, namely, the land, the mines, the raw materials, the instruments of labor, the machines, and the means of transportation, into social

capital, and only by changing the industries so as to make them socialistic, conducted by and for society, can it be brought about that the great industrial pursuits and the constantly growing productivity of social labor (which have been the source of the misery and oppression of the hitherto exploited classes) shall be made the means of the highest welfare and universal, harmonious development."

Kautsky in interpreting this passage gives what may be regarded as the official view of the party. "In place of the private possession of the means of production to put the social possession, *that* is what the economic development constantly makes more urgently necessary." The state as the owner of all productive capital is to be the sole producer. All the citizens must be the employees of the state. There are to be no idlers. Competition is of course out of the question within the state. Labor becomes the basis of all value. The product of the labor belongs to the state or community, and from this each one receives his part, his share of the product of the general toil.

Private Property Possible.

This scheme is communistic so far as all the productive capital is concerned. In labor there is also a communistic element, and the entire product of all the toil belongs to the community. Just how the product of the labor shall be divided is not determined. The state must be supported, the helpless must be provided for. With so strong a communistic trend, it may finally be decided to make the remuneration of each laborer according to his needs, regardless of the work he performs. That would make the distribution as well as the production communistic. The usual claim, however, is that the remuneration is to be in proportion to the work performed, either according to its kind and amount, or according to the hours consumed in performing it. This would be a non-communistic factor.

Suppose that the product of the total labor of the community is greater than is required for present needs and to insure the means of future production; then, if all the product were divided equally among the citizens, there might be private property, such as furniture, art and other produced articles. Or if the reward is according to the amount or kind of labor, a man may earn more than he consumes. If he works six hours when three support him, he can get for the three extra hours certificates for future use, or he can take an equivalent from the magazines of the state, and this will be his private property. If one man consumes all while another takes books or pictures, there will be inequality of possession.

The private property thus created is wealth; but it can never be invested, can never be used to make profit or produce interest. The social democrats repel the insinuation that private property is not possible in their state; it is indeed possible, but only for consumption or use, never for productive purposes, the state being the only producing capitalist. The laborer who now saves one hundred dollars can invest the sum and in the course of time double it; but in the socialistic state a hundred dollars worth of labor certificates, if such are given, would never produce another penny. All private property would be stationary in this respect.

Religion.

The social democrats are largely atheistic; nevertheless their theory of the socialistic state has nothing to do with religion. Their programme declares religion a private affair. Religious societies can be formed, but they must be entirely voluntary, and supported by voluntary contributions, not by the state as is now the case in continental Europe. This would put the religious organizations on the same footing as at present in the United States. There seems, however, to be a difficulty

in the training of ministers. The state would not attend to the matter, and no income from productive capital could be found for this purpose. The training of preachers and the preachers themselves could be provided for only by means secured by laborers, the direct product of their toil; or students and preachers must support themselves.

Details.

We look in vain for details respecting the socialistic state. The subject was discussed for days in the German Parliament a few years ago, and an effort was made to induce the social democrats to unfold their plan more fully. This they refused to do. Kautsky, "On the Erfurt Programme," adopts the same policy. He thinks it absurb to require of the party a definite plan respecting the coming state and the steps which lead from the present condition to the new order of things. "Propositions for a definite form of social relations can be made only for realms which are fully surveyed and controlled. Consequently the social democracy can make positive declarations for the existing society, but not for that which is yet in the future. Propositions which go farther than this may deal with mere suppositions instead of facts, so that they are fancies or dreams, which at best are ineffective." Such details are consequently liable to mislead; hence they are to be avoided.

Inauguration of the Socialistic State.

This reticence respecting the state itself is observed likewise respecting the means to be used in inaugurating that state. These means will have to be determined by circumstances. The declared aim proposes to make the transfer from the present to the future order peaceably, namely, by winning the laborers and others until a majority is secured, and then by legislative enactments establish a new order. But suppose that this majority is not secured, will the party then

abandon their project? Are they in a mood to postpone the revolution indefinitely? Or suppose that those who are in authority oppose the revolutionary legislation because it subverts the principles of the state and is therefore a violation of the constitution? No one imagines that the transfer is likely to be made peaceably, just as no one believes that the party will hesitate to resort to violent measures if thought necessary and likely to lead to the desired result. The European governments as well as the people are convinced that the social democrats will seize the first hopeful opportunity to realize their scheme, whether peaceful or violent means be necessary; and all plans for foreign war take the probability of internal socialistic disturbances into account and estimate the army corps required at home for this purpose.

Immediate Demands.

While the great aim of the social democracy is revolution, it is admitted that it may take a long time before that can be accomplished. In the meanwhile they seek to get all they can out of the present industrial system and social order, for the advantage of the laborers. In parliament, in public meetings, in the press, and in every possible way they advocate the cause of the toilers, and this has won them much favor among the laboring classes even when they do not adopt the socialistic theories. They demand freedom for all and perfect political equality, for women as well as for men; that all laws shall be enacted by the people, and all political affairs under their control; standing armies are to be abolished, their place being taken by militia; that representatives decide all questions of war and peace; that international disputes be settled by means of arbitration; perfect freedom of speech, of organization, and of meetings; the abolition of all laws which discriminate in favor of men against women; secularization of the schools, with com-

pulsory attendance; no pay for court proceedings and for legal counsel by the parties concerned; abolition of capital punishment; all medical aid is likewise to be free; a graduated income tax; besides, the enactment of laws to protect laborers, to fix the legal work day at eight hours, to prevent the industrial employment of children under fourteen years of age, the prevention of night labor except in cases of necessity, uninterrupted pause of thirty-six successive hours every week, the abolition of the truck system, and the appointment of inspectors to see that the laws for the protection of laborers are executed. These are the principal demands. The party now keeps a vigilant watch over the interests of laborers, and by public and private means seeks to promote their welfare.

Propaganda.

The enthusiasm of the social democrats in behalf of their cause is marvelous. They are always ready to labor and sacrifice in the interest of the party, and imprisonment for their utterances and deeds has for them no disgrace, but rather bestows the glorious crown of martyrdom. When in Germany the time of an imprisoned fellow-socialist expires, crowds meet him at the door of the prison and bear him off in triumph. Every member is a missionary for the spread of the socialistic doctrine, and their social system is their religion. Men, women and children engage in the work of propagandism with the utmost zeal and even with fanaticism. Besides a vast literature, theoretical and practical, fiery and often bitter, they use extensively the daily press—their own organs being numerous—and public meetings, and propagate their views in factories, saloons, and homes. They have schools of oratory for the purpose of training men to advocate their cause in public. The corruption, the insolence, and the brutality of capitalism, the subjection and suffering of the laboring classes, the rottenness of the pres-

ent industrial system, and the imperative demand for a change to the socialistic state, are the standing themes. In Berlin, with all the phenomenal vigilance of the police, from ten to twenty thousand circulars are sometimes secretly distributed through the houses in a single night, full of violent denunciation of the authorities, and of fanatical appeals to laborers and to small tradesmen to arise, to unite, and to destroy the tyranny of wealth. The influence thus exerted is powerful and contagious. Not only laborers, but likewise men of means, citizens belonging to the middle class, scholars and noblemen are won. Yet, great as are the advances that have been made, the movement seems only in its initiatory stages.

Criticism.

So remarkable an uprising must have its causes deep down in the age itself. The revolutionary social democracy has gained such vast proportions because there is so much occasion for it both in the condition of things and in the character of society. Whoever fails to look through the movement to the underlying forces and producing causes, fails to discover the diseases of the age and to appreciate the radical cure that is required. But is the panacea to be found in the socialistic state? One can admit fully all the causes which have wrought the evils complained of, can be the most ardent friend of laborers, and without prejudice or affection for the existing system may yet seriously question the value of the proposed scheme. The theory is extremely vague, details are wanting, no plans for its introduction and management are given. Who has the prevision to say whether it will work, or if it does, that it will accomplish its purpose? It seems foolhardy in view of such uncertainty and even danger to think for a moment of destroying the present state and the existing social order, and of putting in jeopardy the welfare

attained, the church, our culture, even our very civilization.

A sober view of the proposed revolution promises a reign of barbarism fully as much as the inauguration of an ideal state of society. Individualism is to be destroyed; but only in a perverted form is it an evil. The real objection to the existing individualism is that it is not individualistic enough; it is too limited, being the privilege of a few, not the advantage of all. So competition is not an unmixed evil; it is needed as a spur to humanity, to arouse the powers and develop the best energies. Only so far as its aim is basely selfish, its method brutal, and its result unjust, is it to be condemned. History teems with proof that extremes beget extremes; but the proof is as conclusive that an extreme introduced by reaction against another extreme may be as great an evil as the one it supplants. An extreme socialism is likely to prove as dire a curse as extreme individualism. Deprive men of productive capital, and you deprive them of one of the greatest incentives to action and of one of the chief sources of happiness. There can be little inspiration in the thought that a man's work is a factor in the great totality of labor, say $\frac{1}{20000000}$ part of the labor of the United States. There is much more inspiration and nobility in voluntarily using one's possessions generously for the public welfare than in submitting to force in the matter. Aside from this, it seems like a robbery of industry and enterprise, economy and sacrifice, to deprive the toiler of the ability to invest what he earns and saves. All personal possessions in the socialistic state are for consumption, none for production; does it not look like cutting off an individual's hand or an arm?

The state is omnipotent in agricultural and industrial pursuits; that is, the masses rule, the majority. The individual must submit unconditionally, the minority likewise.

Unless human nature is radically changed, there will be danger of the worst form of despotism and slavery. The name "democracy" is no guarantee of freedom; this guarantee is found rather in the limits of the power of the majority or mass over the individual. With all the boast of freedom, that boast may be of the emptiest kind. A free press is the best guarantee of freedom for the people. But with all the productive capital in the hands of the state it will be impossible for any individuals to invest in the production of journals or books. The press controlled by the state means by the authority in power; and civil service would have to attain a function unknown to history if these authorities are to use their organs against themselves or permit them to be so used.

So long as manual labor is the test of every value the higher interests of mankind must suffer. Popularity means the average, it stands for mediocrity, for the height of public appreciation. How about the higher education, specialization, the culture of the best intellects for the highest purposes? It would be sad for the nations as well as individuals if the greatest intellectuality and the highest scholarship were obliged to wait until public appreciation made them possible. Exceptional achievements may require exceptional advantages, such as cannot be expected from those who can neither appreciate nor enjoy them.

Taking all these risks into account, considering what the revolution would destroy and endanger, and how utterly uncertain its promises are, it seems incredible that any should gather around this banner of destruction who see whither it tends, unless they have nothing to lose and are sure of improvement by whatever change may be made.

Development.

Whatever dogmatism now controls the social democracy, there are evidences that expediency rather than their dogmas may shape their future course. What is possible and practicable will have to be weighed as well as what is desirable. The movement has sprung up suddenly, and there has not been time for those in it to become fully aware of its meaning and trend, and for its opponents to expose all its weak points and fallacies. The movement has already changed and will no doubt be subject to still greater changes. What these changes are likely to be no one can foretell. The socialistic state, or "the state of the future," is indefinitely postponed; and it will hardly be possible in the long run to satisfy eager laborers with an ideal that distant generations may or may not realize. They want actual and immediate benefits for themselves and their families.

In Germany the social democrats insist as much as ever on their ultimate aim, but respecting it their mission is a propaganda which will win laborers enough to give them the control of legislative enactments or justify violent revolution. For this purpose special efforts have been made to win the agricultural laborers. Heretofore their success has been most marked in the manufacturing centres, but now they are also winning numerous adherents in the country. More and more, however, they devote their active energies to criticism of the existing order and to the securing of actual advantages for laborers. The immediate aim is therefore reform rather than revolution; if all they desire cannot be had, they will take what they can get. The more radical denounce this as temporizing, fearing that the people may eventually become satisfied with their lot and refuse to revolt. The leaders repress present attempts at violence as calculated to alienate the more moderate laborers; in view of a strong government, severe

laws, rigidly executed, a vigilant police, and a powerful standing army, they know that now such an attempt would bring disaster on themselves.

Time and circumstances may allay the embitterment; reflection may lead to hesitation with respect to the overthrow of the present order for the sake of a doubtful and dangerous experiment; the other classes cannot but consider the demands of laborers and may be impelled to meet them; and tentative efforts at socialization, making municipal and national a few of the more public interests at a time, will no doubt yet be found wiser and safer than a total subversion of the existing social system. Society has gained time, and time is apt to work against the revolutionary forces. This much is certain: if the social order is destroyed, it will be the fault of the present order and of those who reap its greatest benefits.

3. Anarchism.

In eras of violent fermentation the diversity among men is usually very marked. The doubts and uncertainties are occasions for different experiments and a divergence of tendencies. Fortunate is it at such times if a few general principles form the basis of unity for thought and action. In the ferment of our times the repellent forces are often much more apparent than the attractive ones. Those in the wildest agitation are perhaps agreed only on one point: that there must be change and that it must be radical; but respecting its nature, the ultimate aim, and the means to be used the opinions and efforts diverge. What wonder that men whose essence is so largely negation and discontent should wage war among themselves? In Germany the social democracy is held together only by the severest party discipline; even then outbreaks of opposition occur, and it is found impossible to make the vast interests that are common absorb the differences which are of minor

importance. The revolutionary parties antagonize and thus weaken one another. So great is their enmity at times that they cannot even co-operate in matters which they hold in common. It is these inner diversities and conflicts which complicate the destructive movements of the day and make a comprehension of them so difficult. The chaos is completed by adding to the socialistic confusions the leaven of anarchism. Both in Europe and America the public and the press are inclined to confound anarchism with the social democracy, or to treat it as a peculiar phase or aggravated form of the same movement. Why are they thus confounded? What is their true relation? They have much in common and this is the reason of their identification; but in important essentials they are diametrically opposed, and therefore must be treated as distinct movements with conflicting principles. In unrest and discontent they are a unit; both agree in radical criticism of the social fabric and in the determination to overthrow the existing industrial system. They are equally revolutionary, insisting that the existing state must be destroyed. As is so common in history, the parties agree in destruction, but not in construction. The social democracy wants to destroy the existing state for the sake of inaugurating a state omnipotent in economic affairs; anarchism wants to destroy the present state for the sake of annihilating the state itself.

Its Principle.

The very word anarchism leads to confusion. We are inclined to use it in the ordinary sense of anarchy, such a condition as occurs in times of revolution, when an old order is destroyed and the new has not yet been born. Anarchism, however, as used in our day, does not stand for an atomistic state of society, but for a social system; and only as such is it proposed to make it a substitute for the present social order.

Anarchists of the present generation want revolution, not for the sake of its attendant anarchy, but as the means for attaining their ideal of society. They regard the state as having no final authority in itself, but as only a contract, which one can enter or from which one can withdraw, as he pleases. The state is pronounced a despotism, a tyranny of the worst sort; it must be destroyed if humanity is to be freed. It has always been under the control of the dominant classes for whose benefit it exists; laborers, consequently, have especial reasons for wishing its destruction. Government, with the laws and the police, is to be abolished; and it is this effort to destroy government and all authority outside of and above the individual, hovering over men and coercing them, which constitutes the essence of anarchism. Only in this way, it is held, can the torture, the robbery, and the murder, which blot the pages of history, be ended. In order to remove the supreme curse from which society has suffered, it is proposed, after annihilating the state, to inaugurate a social condition in which unrestrained freedom is the law. The people are not to be governed from above, but from below, their own free will being at all times the ultimate appeal. At the basis of this theory lies a peculiar view of human nature, namely, that it is perverted by law and authority, but that if left to itself its inherent good qualities will be developed and evils will be suppressed. In the condition of no-government or of self-government the best social forms are to be discovered and introduced. The anarchical paradise will profit by the experience of the past and adopt such organizations as have been found most beneficial. These voluntary associations or federations will take the place of the annihilated state. They are not, however, authoritative over the individual, but the means for the exercise of his freedom and for the attainment of his desires. This freedom decides respecting

all ancient institutions, such as marriage, private property, inheritance, and this decision is final.

Individualism Run Mad.

Anarchism is individualism run mad; it is liberty turned into libertinism. It is useless to argue against this scheme that the very organizations which spring up spontaneously will eventually develop into some kind of a state, and that without some form of government society cannot exist, order cannot be maintained, and peace and well-being will be out of the question. All these advantages, it is thought, will be much better promoted by the perfect freedom of the individuals than by the authority of the state. Anarchical fanaticism is an absolute dogmatism which is not affected by argument. The nations have too much reason to know that there is not only a mad anarchism, but also method in the madness.

Men of Deed.

Anarchists who profess to save society by means of its destruction sometimes claim to be the mildest and most harmless of men. This innocence and this naive spirit find expression in the theory that each one is to be unhindered in the exercise of his freedom. There are, however, among anarchists those who are known as "men of deed." They claim that the progress of history is due mainly to the initiative of a few who have made the epochs, the rest were impelled by them or became their followers. These men of deed or action want to take their place among the leaders of humanity; this they hope to do by violent means for the destruction of the existing society and state, and for this purpose they resort to bombs and infernal machines. Some who do not use the same means applaud their conduct, hope it will terrify and disintegrate society, will lead to imitation, and thus prepare for the overthrow of the present social order; others apologize for these demons or claim that they are

insane, and think an asylum is the place for them, not the gallows. A French poet glorified the throwing of bombs, declaring that the slaughter produced was a small matter, provided only that the motion of the hand in throwing the bomb was graceful. Afterward he was himself wounded by the explosion of a bomb, and his piteous whining indicated a change in his spirit. One anarchist urged certain peasants to revolt. When told that they would be shot down by the authorities he admitted it, but thought the example they set would be valuable and might lead to imitation. Is this sanity?

Revelation of the Age.

Not only in itself is anarchism important, but it is also a most significant revelation of the age. If anarchists are madmen, how does it come that this madness is so common and so chronic in our day? In periods of epochal transition there are apt to be unusual manifestations of extravagant passion and violence. Efforts at destruction are but forerunners of the final catastrophe. Fanaticism, despair, madness, are evidences or general symptoms of the magnitude of the crisis. An age in which anarchism is so prominent as at present, must be one of agitation, of distraction, and of revolution. If any thing can arouse men to an appreciation of the situation, it must be done by the dark prophecy in the spirit of anarchism. It is part of the *Zeitgeist.* The anarchical element is in society itself. It is not a whit more true that society makes criminals than that it makes anarchists; and while society protects itself against its destroyer, it is also the part of wisdom to ask what society has done to nurture such a venomous serpent in its bosom. The best way to overcome anarchism is by destroying its cause in society and in the state.

The Cause of Anarchism.

The countries of continental Europe have been the hot-beds of anarchism, especially the most despotic ones. What re-action the tyranny of the Russian government produces is seen in Nihilism. If Switzerland, Paris, London, and the United States have been frequented by anarchists, it was due chiefly to the fact that in these countries they found places of refuge when expelled from their native lands, and centres for the most effective propagandism. Put now the awakened consciousness of men in our age, with their views of human rights, of freedom and equality, face to face with these despotisms, and what can be expected? A professor of philosophy in Russia assured the writer that in that land intelligence and aspiration lie at the root of the nihilistic movement. The state hinders these; hence the effort to destroy it. Poland is dismembered; its inhabitants are subjects of three states, and yet have no fatherland. The Balkan provinces are unsettled, and the conflict between the races, and between the people and the government, seems never to end. Bohemia cannot forget that it has lost its independence as well as its crown, and that its Hradschin is empty; Hungary remembers Kossuth; all the peoples grouped around Austria are restless, because their nationality is in danger of being absorbed by the dominant one to which their ruler belongs. If these and others despair of government, it is due largely to the history and the character of the governments to which they have been subject.

While it is easy to understand anarchism as the product of despotism because extremes touch, why does it not vanish in countries which are free? We imagine that the desire for freedom ought to be satisfied where the people rule. But various writers claim that the anarchistic spirit may be developed as well among people in a republic

as under a despotism. Freedom develops the demand for freedom, and this demand may degenerate into libertinism. Those who insist on governing themselves are apt to become restive when the government fails to fulfill their desires. Perhaps the minority rebels against the majority. The government may be unstable, frequently changing its ministers, as in France, becoming the prey of partisan ambition and selfish purposes. It may teem with corruptions. The scramble for office, the use of office for base ends, frauds in elections which defeat the will of the people, the infernal rascality in the management of cities, the rule of municipalities by the worst and most degraded elements, the pernicious influence of wealth in the enactment and the execution of the laws, all tend to destroy confidence in the government and in the state. What people are ashamed of they are willing to destroy. A system must be on the verge of ruin if reasons for its continuance can be found only if sought with diligence. In such cases the strong tie of natural affection is gone. The way to cure anarchism is to cure the authorities. But anarchists have another explanation of the anarchistic spirit in free states. In a republic, they say, all are lords; that is, each one lords it over others to his heart's content. Thus the weak and upright may be domineered over by the strong and the unscrupulous. And it is well known that where the law does least for the people and is little respected, the best opportunity is given to knaves and the spirit of anarchy is fostered. An anarchist says: "Every state is a despotism, no matter whether the despot be one or many;" therefore logic demands that every state be annihilated.

Origin of Anarchism.

The origin of modern anarchism is to be found in the middle of this century. Proudhon is usually regarded as its father, and Bakunin and Krapotkin as its chief apostles. As early as 1840 Proudhon published a volume which contained the statement that property is theft, but it was not till some years later that he fully announced his anarchistic theory. About the same time as Proudhon, Max Stirner (Casper Schmidt) appeared as an anarchistic author. His volume on "The Individual and His Property" appeared in 1845; and as he was among the first in the field, though he did not become the most influential, some have regarded him as the real author of modern anarchism. Since he is but little known, some of his wild views are here given. In order that society may be put on a more perfect basis, he wants the state destroyed, and voluntary associations, in which perfect individual freedom prevails, established. "Do what you please," is an anarchistic phrase which he wants most fully realized. Selfishness and libertinism are the essence of his views. Respecting the association which is to take the place of the state he says: "The association is my own creation; it is not holy, it is not an intellectual power above me. I am unwilling to be the slave of my own maxims; I give no guarantee for them and constantly subject them to my criticism. I do not bind myself to the association for the future, I do not vow to be faithful to it. I am to myself more than the state is to me, more than the church, more than God and all other objects; therefore I am to myself also infinitely more than the association. No being, not even my fellow-man, is for me an object of respect, but simply an object of observation, which interests me or not, which I use or not, as I please. If I can use him I make an agreement with him, because by means of union I can

accomplish more than when alone." Another sentence shows his absolute selfishness: "I do not want freedom or equality for men; I want only my power over them, to make men my property, to use and enjoy them." If he fails in his purpose, he glories in the fact that a way of escape is left him in suicide. His view respecting property is equally extreme: "Neither God nor human society is the proprietor, but only the individual. Whatever you have the *power* to be, that you have the *right* to be. Enjoy; you have a right to enjoy. But if you have worked and permit the enjoyment of the fruits of your labor to be taken from you, then you are served right. What, then, is my property? Nothing except that which is within my power. To what property have I a *right?* To all that I can *seize.* I give to myself the right of possession by taking possession of things. Whatever cannot be taken from me continues to be my property. Therefore let force decide the question of my ownership; I expect every thing from my force."

Here we have a total abolition of ethics, a spirit of savagery, a reign of brutality. We quote a few more passages, not because every anarchist goes to this extreme, but because they give a view of what is possible in human degeneration and of what actually lurks in some minds, for the author is not solitary in his sentiments. "Seize and take what thou needest! Thus the war of all against all is proclaimed. I alone decide what I want to possess. Only then does the rabble cease to be the rabble when it seizes and appropriates property. I am proprietor, I agree with others respecting my property. If the association does not suit me, I revolt against it and defend my property. I am proprietor; but property is not sacred. I am proprietor of all I need and can appropriate. If men once attain that degree of progress which robs them of all respect for the sacredness of property, then each one will be a proprietor,

just as all slaves become freemen so soon as they refuse to regard their lords as lords." Family, piety and fraternity he pronounces superstitions. He thinks the state rests on the slavery of labor. Free labor and you destroy the state. R. Meyer, from whom these passages are quoted, says he learned that this man, who regarded the world as his and thought he need only seize and appropriate it, died of starvation!

Anarchistic Meetings.

For the purpose of studying the movement the author attended a number of anarchistic meetings in Berlin. After the repeal of the law to suppress socialism these meetings were public. Permission for holding them had to be secured from the police, and a lieutenant of police and a policeman were always on the platform, the former having the right to dissolve the meeting whenever he thinks any remark or conduct requires it. The first meeting attended revealed the view of anarchists respecting organization. Their notion of individual freedom will not tolerate any authority over them; how then subject an assembly to the authority of officers of their own choice? At the opening of the meeting a man appeared who stated the anarchistic view of authority, and solved the difficulty in the way of perfect individual freedom in an organization to which the individual is subject, by saying: "I have called this meeting and I am your presiding officer." He then asked three others to sit on the platform with him and they were the officers! Very suggestive of what might be expected in an anarchistic community—some despot arising to govern an association which cannot govern itself.

At a meeting of the unemployed, where both social democrats and anarchists were present, Mr. Liebknecht, a leader of the social democracy, presided and made an address. He was followed by Dr. Gumplowicz, an anarch-

ist, who spoke sneeringly and contemptuously of the socialist Liebknecht as trying to overthrow the state and yet as a member of parliament recognizing the state. In the midst of his tirade against the existing authority he exclaimed, "The state has always been a band of thieves and robbers." At once the lieutenant of police arose, put on his helmet, laid his hand on the shoulder of the Doctor and said, "In the name of the law I arrest the speaker." The excited and turbulent audience arose, and Liebknecht and the others on the platform with difficulty restrained its fury. Dr. Gumplowicz tried to get from the platform into the audience, where it might have been impossible to prevent efforts at rescue. With great effort the lieutenant and the policeman forced him from the rear of the platform and took him out of the hall. For his speech, his anarchistic character in general being taken into account, he received from the state he denounced a sentence of eighteen months imprisonment.

At another meeting, called by the anarchists, the presiding officer assumed command just as at the first one. It had been called to protest against the police, who were charged with beating inoffensive laborers as they left an assembly. On the platform sat a reporter who had defended the police in his journal. The president asked the audience: "What shall we do with this reporter?" "Put him out," was the answer. The president asked him to leave, but he refused. Turning to the audience the president said: "I have asked him to leave, but he refuses to go. Let him stay; we anarchists oppose the use of force against individual freedom." And he remained. One of the speakers was a bookbinder, a leading anarchist, whose name is Werner. After severely denouncing the police and the authorities generally, he left the meeting. The police were on his track, he fled from Berlin and Ger-

many, went to Antwerp, took the steamer for America, but was not permitted to land, being obliged to return by the same steamer to Antwerp. One of the speakers at this meeting declared that the use of unwarranted force by the police should be resisted by force. At this the lieutenant of police arose, put on his helmet, and pronounced the meeting closed. The thousands left the hall without disturbance, though there was some hissing and hooting and singing.

A few years ago German papers had long boasted that the police were too much on the alert to permit anarchists to commit such violence in Germany as had occurred in France, Spain, and Italy. Then two bombs were discovered in Berlin by the police. At once the anarchists called three meetings to discuss "Anarchism and Violence." The meeting attended by the writer was presided over by a young man, the speakers, young men, were perfectly free in contradicting one another, and the audience consisted chiefly of young men and young women, most of them well dressed. Violence was denounced because *inexpedient.* If resorted to now it will keep others from joining the anarchists, and will be a welcome plea for the existing authorities to resort to severe measures for overthrowing the movement. The violence on the part of the men of action was of course treated as an inevitable product of the intolerable evils of the present system, and thus the blame was thrown on the social situation. Men are driven to desperation, hence the violence, the murders.

Wild and impractical as the anarchistic scheme is, the impression received at the various meetings was that the speakers were honest, that they were convinced that the present social system has outlived itself and that society will be vastly improved by substituting voluntary associations or a federation of such associations for the present

authority of the state. Many anarchists are theorists, perhaps dreamers, whose notion of absolute individual liberty would prevent them from interfering with this liberty by violent measures, and it is unjust to put them in the same category with the men of deed, however deluded we may believe them to be. Nor do all the anarchists make the impression of being fanatics; despair of the existing order and of the state seems to drive them to their anarchistic extreme. Certain is it that anarchism is a phenomenon requiring the most careful diagnosis; without such a diagnosis denunciation will but fan the flame it seeks to extinguish.

Anarchistic Diversity.

In many instances therefore the only terror connected with anarchism is in the name. Confidence in the goodness of human nature inspires anarchists to believe that, if the authority over men can be destroyed, they will naturally establish the best social condition, in which the good will flourish and freedom find full exercise. As the new order of society they hope to establish is to be based on innocence, mildness, gentleness, and equity, so they profess to hope that its introduction will require no violence, but will come peaceably, as the spontaneous product of progressive social development. Anarchism is another of those movements in which agreement prevails on a few cardinal points, but great diversity respecting others. While all agree on the annihilation of the state, a difference of opinion prevails respecting the social form which is to take its place. Anarchists have a strong leaven of Nihilism; they are so intent on the destruction of the present fabric that they leave it to the future to determine what order shall grow out of the chaos. Like the social democrats, they postulate a few things, but refuse to give particulars.

Anarchists cannot be social democrats because they do not want a state to control the industries; but there are many other forms of socialism, as stated above, and it is not strange that numerous anarchists are usually classed as socialistic. The English translator of Laveleye's "Socialism of To-Day" says in his preface: "The term socialist is an exceedingly elastic one. It has been used to include a revolutionary anarchist, like Bakunin, who seeks to destroy, by any and every means, all states and institutions, and eradicate utterly the very idea of authority, as well as a constructive statesman of the conservative type, like Prince Bismarck, whose aim is to concentrate much power and many functions in the hands of a paternal government. There are Tory and Radical Socialists, State and Communal Socialists, Christian and Atheist Socialists, Socialists who are Collectivists, Communists, or Anarchists, Socialists of the Chair, and 'Socialists of the Pothouse.' Other shades and subdivisions might easily be added." Some of the numerous possible forms of socialism could be established by anarchism. Sometimes an anarchistic socialism or a communistic anarchism is advocated. Anarchists have repeatedly tried to get into conventions of the social democrats, but have met with emphatic rejection. The public does not always distinguish sharply between the social democracy and anarchy, being apt to class with anarchists all who attempt to overthrow the present system.

Nihilism.

Russian Nihilism must be taken as a movement by itself, due to the peculiar conditions prevalent in Russia. It has not been primarily a movement of laborers who, especially in the country, have an unbounded confidence in the Czar, and are not yet sufficiently enlightened or aroused to consider seriously their own condition and to attempt any radical change. The advocates of nihilism are to be found among the more ambi-

tious and better educated classes, such as feel most keenly the oppression of the autocratic and tyrannical government, who want more freedom, more part in the nation's affairs, a removal of flagrant abuses, a constitution and a parliament; they are literary men, students, teachers, the learned proletariat, members of the nobility and officers in the army, and others who are influenced by their spirit. Bakunin has been called "the apostle of nihilism," but no less has he been designated an anarchist and a socialist.

Literature.

The literature on the revolutionary movement, pro and con, is very extensive. See the various histories of socialism. The first volume of Roscher's "Political Economy" gives a summary view of the communistic theory and refers to a number of works on the subject. On socialism and communism in France, L. Stein's book, "*Der Socialismus und Coumunismus des heutigen Frankreichs*," Leipzig. The article on Communism, Ency. Brit., gives a sketch of the history of the subject and also an account of the existing communistic societies. On American experiments see Nordhoff, "Communistic Societies of the United States," Harper & Brothers, and Noyes' "History of American Socialisms," Lippincott, Philadelphia. The article in the International Cyclopædia on Communism is both historical and critical, and also gives some literature.

The works on the social democracy, especially in the German language, are legion. For the origin and growth of the movement see Dawson, mentioned above. The "Manifesto of the Communist Party," by Marx and Engels, Reeves, London, gives the essential elements in a compendious form. The Programmes adopted by the party at different conventions do the same. The Erfurt Programme, the present basis of the party, is interpreted in a small volume, "*Das Erfurter Program*," by Karl Kantsky, published

by Dietz, Stuttgart. The elaborate and able work by Karl Marx, "Capital," translated by Moore and Aveling, Appleton & Co., New York, 3 vols., is the intellectual foundation of the movement. The best summary of its views is by Dr. Schæffle, "The Quintessence of Socialism," Sonnenschein. "The Impossibility of Social Democracy," by the same, is a criticism of the system.

Felix Dubois, "The Anarchist Peril," translated by R. Derechef, T. F. Unwin, London. Rae discusses Anarchism and Russian Nihilism in the eighth and ninth chapters of his history. H. L. Osgood, "Scientific Anarchism," Political Science Quarterly, March, 1889. Josiah Warren, "The Science of Government." Among the earlier works are, "*Der Einzelne und sein Eigenthum*," and Proudhon, "What is Property?"

CHAPTER VII.

SOLUTION BY EVOLUTION.

I. EVOLUTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL. 2. EVOLUTION OF ORGANIZATIONS.

Revolution, When Justifiable.

A dogmatic rejection of revolution may be as objectionable as its dogmatic advocacy. On this point we cannot afford to be misunderstood. In the process of development a position may be attained by nations when a revolution seems inevitable or, at least, the best and most direct way out of difficulties that otherwise appear to be insuperable. So wholly wrong may a course be that the only efficient remedy consists in ending it and beginning anew. The only cure for sin is its destruction. England has given numerous examples how freedom can be advanced, step by step, by wresting authority and power from the crown. But shall the Netherlands submit quietly to the tyranny of Spain until liberty itself is crushed? Can liberty be true if slavery exists in the American Republic and makes freedom its minister? There are times when there is but one alternative, namely, right or wrong, despotism or liberty; and then a patriotic death is better than a cowardly life.

Revolution *per se* therefore is not rejected. If it is the true and the only remedy for existing ills, then every brave man knows his place. Revolution, like a strike, is, however, the last resort because the most doubtful and most dangerous. Will it really destroy the evils? It might but

cultivate the soil for a richer crop. Is there not some good worth preserving which would be in danger of destruction? If the good is destroyed with the evil, what guarantee have we that it will flourish after the revolution? Even if all that is doubtful about the beneficial results of a destructive revolution were made certain, are we sure that the same results could not be attained better and more justly some other way? All we insist on is that these matters be thoroughly considered, that impartial, dispassionate inquiry take the place of embittered prejudice and thoughtless destruction. Men criminally play with fire in the midst of petroleum and gunpowder, and it is time to warn them that if they destroy ruthlessly the social structure, they may themselves be buried under its ruins. No wise pilot will risk a splendid steamer with its valuable freight and more valuable lives, by moving with full speed in fog or darkness when shoals and rocks are near. He moves at all only so far as he is certain of his course and can see ahead.

As the proposed revolution already considered is not the solution, we now turn to the other alternative, Evolution.

Evolution and Revolution.

Revolution, as we have seen, means a change of principles, the destruction of basis and superstructure, and the laying of a new foundation. It does not stop to lop off dead branches or graft new scions on an old tree, but lays the axe at the root of the tree itself. It wants new wine, but also new bottles into which to put the wine. Revolution sees and emphasizes the existing evil, but fails to see the existing good, or despairs of its development so as to overcome the evil. A complete principiant change is at any rate regarded as the most speedy, if not the only, way to secure the desired end. Evolution, on the other

hand, seeks to unfold something that already exists, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. Hegel was fond of saying that the flower is not destroyed when the fruit appears, but the fruit absorbs the flower, the fruit taking up the flower into itself and preserving it, though in a higher and more developed form. It is thus evident that between evolution and revolution there is a radical difference in spirit, in aim, and generally also in method. Evolution involves reform; but it has a deeper meaning than that usually attached to reform. It wants to remove evils; it does not, however, stop with the effort to remove ills, it is also intent on developing the true, the right, the good, and the beautiful, whose germs now exist. In these it beholds possibilities which it seeks to realize, and prophecies which it hopes to fulfill. Reform is sought by means of evolution in order to make it most healthy and most fruitful. Evolution removes the old leaf that remains on the tree in the spring, by means of the germ which pushes it away, takes its place, and produces a fresh, green leaf. The higher life, the higher form, the better state, take the place of the lower and imperfect condition. Evolution is destruction by construction; it promotes health and thus throws off disease; an effete growth is sloughed off because a new, vital element supplants it; error is overthrown by the truth, just as darkness vanishes so soon as the light comes. Therefore in evolution we deal with a constructive force and with positive reform.

Evolution versus Revolution.

Both reason and history decide in favor of evolution. Even if a change of principle is required, the most thorough method of producing the change is by means of evolution; in other words, evolution must prepare for and effect the revolution. This is seen in a measure by the revolutionary social democracy. At first it was thought

that the socialistic state might speedily be inaugurated; but now it is admitted that it may take decades or ages, if not centuries. Men and systems must be prepared for it; in other words, evolution must lead to it. The law of historic development advocated by Karl Marx is but the law of an evolution which inevitably leads to revolution. In all human affairs the mental condition is of primary importance; and whatever changes may be effected suddenly and violently in the environment, the transformation of the mind is a slower process. What is personal and ethical requires time for growth. These facts are among the most evident lessons of history. Baerenbach says: "History proves that lasting effects for society are obtained neither by violent revolution, nor by police and administrative government, but solely by means of the long but sure way of continuous reform, by means of organic transformation and development." Rodbertus thought it might require five hundred years to introduce the socialistic state. Sidney Webb, himself a socialist, says: "The necessity of the constant growth of the social organism has become axiomatic. No philosopher now looks for anything but the gradual evolution of the new order from the old, without breach of continuity or abrupt change of the entire social tissue at any point during the process. The new becomes itself old, often before it is consciously recognized as new; and history shows us no example of the sudden substitutions of Utopian or revolutionary romance."* He quotes H. S. Hyndman, another socialist, who says: "I am aware that there are some who suppose that our present bourgeois arrangements must be totally destroyed and others substituted almost at a blow. But however successful a revolution might be, it is certain that mankind cannot change its

* Historic Basis of Socialism, in "Fabian Essays."

whole nature all at once. Break the old shell, certainly; but never forget the fact that the new forms *must* grow out of the old."

Gradual evolution as the law of progress is so emphatically the lesson of history and is so rational that specialists, thinkers, and inquirers do not need reference to the numerous authorities which advocate this view. We cherish the hope that the great body of the people in America and England, the workingmen of course included, will insist on evolution as the only safe and sure way of solving the Social Problem. Yet hardly without a miracle can we expect the movement toward the needed reconstruction of society to be altogether peaceful. For that the changes required are too radical, and many of those demanding them are not inclined to wait patiently for the slow work of evolution. Especially in America do we find impatient loborers, natives as well as foreigners, who want to hasten the process, and are disposed to resort to violent measures, in order by means of the speedy transformation of society to derive some benefits for themselves. Others, extreme conservatives, want to resist all change, and they as well as the revolutionists may cause outbreaks. Even those who agree respecting progress by means of evolution, are likely to disagree respecting methods, means, and end. We must therefore look for numerous disturbing influences, for antagonism and conflicts.

Thoroughness of the Evolution.

The destruction proposed by violent anarchism and nihilism may be more sudden than that wrought by the slow process of evolution, but that does not make it more thorough. Not a shallow optimism, beholding only the good to be developed, induces us to advocate destruction by construction; we fully admit the existence of evils which must be rooted out. If in the

process of development certain ills are found to be of such a character as to require a change of principle, such a change can be adopted consistently. The evolution itself may involve elements of revolution as well as of reform, without becoming in its essence revolution. Not only does it discriminate between the good to be developed and the evil to be eradicated, it also inquires whether the conditions complained of may not be inevitable. Above all, it seeks to learn the causes of the evils, in order to concentrate its energies against them. We do not hesitate to charge the ordinary revolutionary movements with not being revolutionary enough. They want to change conditions, but fail to emphasize the need of changing men, while the needed evolution aims to change both men and their external conditions.

System.

The solutions proposed in different countries and by social investigators afford a valuable and interesting study. Aside from such dogmatic theories as that of the social democracy, there is in general a lack of definite and comprehensive proposals. Good rules and excellent hints are given; but can they be made effective? Will they, even if this is done, meet the case? Some of the proposals are too haphazard; they are partial, good so far as they go, but not calculated to effect a total cure. The main difficulty seems to be this: the evils to be removed are taken too much as isolated, and are treated as if they could be remedied one by one, separately, whereas they are connected, interlaced and intergrown, forming an organism, and as such they must be dealt with by the solution. These evils must be apprehended as a system; so the remedy must be a system that deals with this system of evils. We must go to the root of the ills; with this the remedy must begin and then extend to the trunk and branch, to flower and fruit.

We are not now concerned with the root of the ills so far as this is found in nature and is inevitable. The evils we deal with are those whose removal is possible. For the root of these we must look to man himself. So far as men are concerned the causes are twofold: they have not the requisite knowledge, and they do not apply the knowledge which they have; in other words, they need more light and they need the disposition to walk in the given light. This twofold change in men, namely, in intellect and in disposition, must result in such a change in institutions and in external conditions generally as will harmonize them with the knowledge attained. Capitalists and employers may do the best they know how and yet be blamed for their conduct by laborers and the community at large; that is, to their disposition is attributed what is really due to their lack of knowledge. Frequently laborers also are mistaken in their course because their knowledge is inadequate. The history of strikes proves this. Employers as well as laborers, even with the best intentions, may at times be helpless; the circumstances are unfavorable, the situation is embarrassing, they see no other way open than the one they take. It may be impossible for an employer to raise wages and continue his business; ignorance or unbelief in such a case may lead the employed to injustice in thought and act. And if we take into account our total situation, it is admitted by the most advanced economists that we have not the requisite knowledge to overcome all the difficulties that face us.

A striking instance of the removal of troubles by the diffusion of knowledge is given by Dr. Gould, formerly of our national Labor Bureau, in his testimony before the English Commission on Labor. He states that a few years ago the notion prevailed among laborers in Connecticut that the profits were altogether too large in the industries

in comparison with the wages. This caused ill feeling and many strikes occurred. In order to get the exact facts of the case the Connecticut Commissioner of Labor determined to investigate the matter. His inquiry included 970 establishments, the books being freely opened to him. "The result was the entire calming down of this unreasonable agitation, which had existed hitherto in the state, and strikes have been exceedingly infrequent since." Some employers think it to their interest to keep their employees ignorant of their affairs, while others take them into their confidence so far as the state of the business is concerned. Experience has shown that in some cases the latter works admirably.

Often of course men know more and better than they do; the difficulty is in the disposition. This applies to all classes; employers and employed sin against the light they have. The present situation would be impossible if they did the duty that is clear. Men will not do to others as they want to be done by; hence the ceaseless conflicts. We therefore do not hesitate to pronounce the moral change of men, the creation of a spirit of fraternity, the most imperative of the many urgent needs.

This makes clear the system according to which we are to seek the solution. From the centre we move toward the circumference. Man himself is the centre; his head and heart are the vital parts to be affected. Institutions are the circumference, but this is drawn from the centre and depends on that for its character. That the evolution of man instead of things is made the chief thing heightens the difficulty of the solution; but who could wish a solution, were it possible, which does not involve, and consist in, the elevation and development of man himself? This is the very essence of the solution, this is the glory of the work. The change to be effected is social, including the whole of

society. This social totality must be included in the system adopted, and it adds to the magnitude as well as to the grandeur of the task.

Individuals must be changed; their relations to one another must be changed; and social institutions must be changed. Our task therefore involves the individual, society and its organizations, the state and its institutions; all these factors are directly concerned in the solution of our problem.

1. *Evolution of the Individual.*

In turning now to the specific objects of evolution we consider first of all the individual, the primitive social factor. The ills to be removed are social; hence the remedy must likewise be social. Even the strongest individuality is affected by the social environment, and for the majority of men the average morality is the highest ethical standard. While we may take with allowance the statement that society makes criminals, we cannot deny that the prevalent crimes are largely due to the views and practices of a community. Since, however, society is composed of individuals, its character is necessarily determined by their character. This has already been clearly shown, though it cannot be too much emphasized. We place great stress on the influence which society exerts on the individual, but insist that society consists of individuals in their associated capacity. Inordinate haste and superficial generalization seek to escape the enormous task involved in the work of developing each individual in society. We do not want to minimize the influence of social arrangements and laws and institutions; all these elements of common power are fully considered. They cannot, however, influence the organism of society as a totality otherwise than through the members; men are not affected *en masse*, but as distinct personalities, not as abstractions,

but as concrete realities. Where is the head or the heart of the social organism with which all the members are vitally, indissolubly connected? How can you affect this head or heart and at the same time affect all the distinct parts? Every inquiry into the actuality of society shows that there is social evolution in distinction from institutional evolution only so far as the individuals are developed. A preceding chapter has made this evident.

Socialization of the Individual.

We of course do not take the individual as isolated, but as associated with others, a member of the social organism. Not as abstracted from society do we consider his development, but as a social factor. What now determines the value and power of an individual in society? The character and strength of his personality. These, as shown already, are not to be abstracted from the position and possession of the personality, but all are to be taken in connection with it. An individual becomes the strongest social power by the utmost personal development and by the increase of such possessions as have social influence. Personal evolution is the most essential, for the use a man makes of his position and means will depend on what he himself is. The unfolding of an individual's social power is nothing but the development of the personality; it is not a foreign element added to a man, but his truest self. It is the strength which a man becomes that manifests itself in society; he has no other strength as social power.

The personal development which is at the same time social consists in an evolution of knowledge and of the disposition, growth in light and in the desire to use it for the illumination of humanity. The evolution of the personality thus is not selfish but social, for associated purposes, just as a teacher seeks to make the utmost of himself for the sake of being the utmost to his pupils. It is not an aban-

donment of self, but an enlargement, a gain; can it be a loss to Aristotle as a personality to be the head of a school and a teacher of humanity? He remains all he was as an individual and becomes a social power besides. By the social evolution of the individual he does not abandon any personal rights, but they are co-ordinated with duties. The beauty of a flower is not the less its own because it is also the beauty of the garden; indeed, it can be the beauty of the garden only because that beauty is its own. The individual is to be educated for society. He is to find his true self in society, as its member, as influenced by it and influencing it, as robbing himself and robbing society if he fails in his social relations and duties. In thus taking his proper place in society he attains an enlargement of self, an increase of genuine freedom, an exaltation of the personality. He regards the great problems of humanity as his problems, and takes his place in society in order to help in their solution. Thus the socialization of the individual by social education means to make the interests of society his own, to break through the little shell of egoism and enter the large sphere of altruism.

The Transition Era.

In this transition era, when the individualistic education is felt to be defective and when socialistic theories are equally extreme, it is difficult to find the right educational medium. We must retain the individual, yet we want him to be social; this state we can best express by a socialized individuality. But what kind of education will accomplish this? Here is a question which sociology, when once developed systematically, may help us to answer. But instruction in this respect must be supplemented by training. Ethical principles must be embodied in men, so as to become personal. Thus far the emphasis has been chiefly placed on the learning of theories as the condition of prac-

tice; but it is worth while to consider whether the time has not come to emphasize practice and experience as the condition for understanding theories. Our whole educational system may have to be revised in order to socialize it, while at the same time developing the personality to the utmost. The elements of political economy, the principles of utility, the cardinal facts with respect to thrift, to production and distribution, and to material welfare, should be a part of all instruction in primary and secondary schools, so as to make these important factors the possession of all the pupils. The social relations ought to be studied; to the long emphasis on individual rights should now be added an equal emphasis on social rights and duties; and, so far as possible, what is learned in this respect ought be practically taught by training the pupils to do it.

This socialization of the individual in the family and the school, or this social education and training, is still a new subject and nearly all the work respecting it remains yet to be done. The task to be performed is nothing less than the moral change of the individual, creating in him a social instead of a selfish disposition, giving the love of the neighbor its place as actually included in the true love of the true self as a social factor. In this study the view given by the apostle Paul in 1 Cor. xii., of the body and its members, the unity in diversity, is of first significance. Every citizen ought to be instructed in the nature of the state, the basis of civil government, the extent and validity of its authority, and the duties of citizenship. In society, in the state, each individual is to take his proper place. "Each one doing his part," is Plato's idea of righteousness. This is, however, but one side of a great truth. The other is that each is to receive what belongs to him—"to each his own." This means that to no one is to be given any place or authority or honor or money which does not

belong to him. Whatever is bestowed on one to whom it does not belong is necessarily taken from some one to whom it actually belongs. All these ideas as wrought into the personality ought to be made the basis of the social relations and duties.

We must treat the social actuality as the soil to be cultivated. With that we must start, not with dreams or vague theories. But from this actuality we want to proceed to something beyond, moving onward toward the social ideal. We stand on the present, but reach out toward the realization of the new social aspirations.

The University of Life.

More will be said on education under the head of the function of the state. The new social ideas so far as true are to be made personal by means of instruction and training in the family, the school, and the church. But no less important than these is the education received in the great university of life; that is, in the observation and experience, after the ordinary education at school has been completed, in the home, in the social circle, in travel, in business, and in the professions. In many respects the life as distinguished from the school in a technical sense is the great educator. It is the university in which all receive instruction; some enter scarcely any other; and even those who have received the highest training in the schools enter it for a post-graduate course. Some things are taught in this university which the schools cannot teach; other lessons it impresses more deeply than colleges and seminaries; and for all that is learned in the schools it furnishes the best means of application.

This university is pre-eminently a social institution for social culture, and its educational and formative power surpasses all other institutions combined. The lessons are so various, the teachers so numerous, the influences so con-

tradictory, that the result is often confusing and bewildering. Here men are overwhelmed, they lose themselves, they take the color of their surroundings instead of making the environment but the means of developing and strengthening the social personality. The educational reforms in the schools are of vital importance; but the systematic study of the university of life is comparatively a new sphere and no other deserves more careful inquiry. Millions graduate into this university with little preparation for its new scenes and lessons and duties, and they are left to shift for themselves. Here is the point where a new process of evolution is to be begun. Those that drop out of the school into this untried world are the ones who most of all need guidance and help. Instead of a break there should be continuity of development. Those who come from the common schools need it, the armies of boys and girls thrown upon their own resources after years of instruction under the constant direction of teachers. The family does this work but in feeble part; often the youth prematurely regard themselves independent of its guidance. Here is the time when an interested, wise, loving friend is beyond price. Society is entered, but much as a drop falls into a stream, to be absorbed and lost. Hence the numerous social things and the few social personalities in the true sense. Sometimes the church with its institutions is the only teacher of social ethics for those suddenly thrown upon and into society, and an unrealized responsibility rests upon it in this respect.

It ought to be seriously considered whether for the pupils thus let loose upon the world some new institutions for special social culture ought not to be established. The need of such training, after the school is *finished*, is felt also in the professions. What embarrassments await the young physician, lawyer, preacher, and teacher! The numerous

institutions and conventions of professional men are proof that they feel the need of special study and training and association in the university of life. The need does not diminish with the years, but grows; and new institutions are required in order to meet the new demands made by the growth of years and experience. In our social era life is being more and more appreciated as the sphere of altruistic instead of selfish activity. The time has come for the development and exercise of the power of the social personality; and it is in this after-school, in this great university of life, that we must look mainly for the socialization of the individual.

Education of Laborers.

From a twofold point of view the education of laborers should be considered, namely, for their own sake and for the sake of society. Laborers demand recognition as persons, and resent the treatment which puts them on a level with machines and brute force. But if they want their personality respected they must make it such as to be worthy of respect. Not only do laborers often blame a system or other persons when the blame rests on themselves, but they also frequently seek relief in a change of conditions when their own character most of all needs changing. There may now and then be a learned blacksmith or shoemaker or other laborer, but as a class we cannot expect the workingmen to be scholars. For this they have not the conditions. Even among capitalists scholarship or even its appreciation is scarce.

But with all the difficulties in the way, many laborers might give greater worth to their personalities. They need a higher appreciation of education and greater effort to secure its advantages. There has been a hopeful awakening in this respect; many have been impelled to seek better culture for themselves and their children, as the con-

dition of rising. Others are totally indifferent to the matter and fail to use the advantages offered. They choose to remain ignorant, and this choice serves to keep them weak and inefficient, unfits them for places of trust and command, and in the competition of life they will be driven to the wall or trampled upon by the better educated and the more worthy.

We are here speaking of those who voluntarily degrade themselves, not of such as are crushed by society; and if we do not spare the guilt of society, why should we apologize for the guilt of the individual? The man who prefers the saloon to his family and the library, is degraded; and he who prefers rudeness and cruelty and vulgarity and filth and ignorance to refinement and humanity and nobility and cleanliness and culture, must accept the natural consequences of his choice. Society must first be degraded before it can be reconciled to such degradation.

There is, however, another side. The evils with which an individual curses himself also curse society. How much ignorance can a nation dependent on the vote of its free citizens tolerate? This subject cannot be discussed here; it belongs to the question of the function of the state. There can be no doubt that a certain degree of enlightenment is essential for the privilege of citizenship in a free state. Even the education of the laborer for his own sake is a concern of society. He is an integral part of society and the social organism owes him duties. To the strongest appeal made to the laborer to educate himself should be added the strongest possible appeal to society to educate him.

2. *Evolution of Organizations.*

Social organization is the natural result of the contact of social personalities. As soon as we discuss this organization we are impressed with the prevalent confusion respecting the relation of the individual to associations. In the same address the writer has heard organization emphasized as the controlling factor in life, the individual being declared powerless; and then the emphasis was placed on the individual as if he were the dominant social force. Both views are true and both false. Social power is both individual and organized; individuals make the organization and then the organization influences the individual. Whatever is purely individual is personal, subjective; whatever is social goes out from the individual, has its source in the personal and subjective element, yet is not confined to the individual but passes to others, becomes an objective reality outside of the individual. The personality objectifies itself in society, and a man becomes social when he is not merely himself but also a factor of society. Society consists of personalities which project themselves toward each other; it consists of relations, institutions, organizations, in which individuals are the essence, the substantial reality, but always in their associated capacity. Every organization is a combination and multiplication of individual energies—a web whose threads are personalities, threads therefore not isolated, but woven together and thus forming a unit. The power of organization is the organized power of individuals. An individual may contend with an individual; an individual may contend with an organization; or individuals associated together may contend with others thus associated: always individuals with individuals, but in different relations. With this kept in view we are neither in danger of losing the

individual in the organization, nor of missing the significance of the organization itself.

The power of organization has been pronounced a discovery of the nineteenth century, and the power of the century has been called the power of organization. There is danger now of absorbing the individual in the association, losing sight of the fact that the initiative, the impulse, the force, the action of associations is always individual. It has been remarked that competition is the element of the strong, while the power of the weak consists in combination. One strong man may be mightier than a thousand weak ones, if his whole power is used in dealing with each separately; but they may be immeasurably superior to him if they so combine that the thousand units become one. But the strong may also combine and multiply their strength. Combination on one side leads to combination on the other. This is a law which is at work everywhere. Laborers combine to fight capitalists, and capitalists combine to fight or subject laborers. Thus we have organizations for offence and defence, for the protection of rights and for the exercise of tyranny. If organization is the power of our day it is also our danger. It may be the substitution of organized might in place of right.

The Law of Organization.

Why do men combine? There is a large sphere of what may be termed unorganized society, formed by relationship, by ties of affinity, by neighborhood, by similarity of taste, pursuit, or occupation, by chance acquaintance, or by circumstances of various kinds. Certain laws or rules of etiquette prevail in company where there is no constitution or regular organization. A very large part of life is taken up by this kind of society and it deserves profound study. Important principles govern it, and he who is master of them may obtain a much needed

control over himself and society. No one questions that here is a realm in which social regeneration is needed. Many a life is frittered away because absorbed by the distractions, the pleasures, the vanities and inanities of aimless society. But our concern, so far as the Social Problem is concerned, pertains chiefly to organized society, and its laws are of prime importance to us. The family, the church, and the state have received attention from scholars; but between the family and the state there is a vast realm of voluntary organization which has not received so much study.

For the existing and the possible organizations the laws ought to be formulated. Men may combine for the most varied purposes; but it is always for the sake of accomplishing some desired aim which can be furthered better by union than by separation. The initiative is usually taken by one person or a few individuals. These few realize a need, they arouse the consciousness of others so as to feel the same need, these combine in order to supply it, men in other places are made aware of the same need and also combine—thus, as if by contagion, needs are awakened, associations are formed, and what was local becomes national and international. A single consciousness in advance of others may be prophetic of what shall be the dominant movement of an age and the world. It is the advanced ones who make the advances. The combinations can be made for all desirable purposes, intellectual, æsthetic, moral, religious, industrial, social, pleasurable. It thus becomes evident that we must go to psychology for an explanation of the organizations. The very fact that we call them "voluntary" reveals the function of the will in them. To the consciousness of what is desirable and to the intellectual apprehension of what will supply it must be added the effort of the will. Many organizations seem to

come into being almost of themselves; but others have more art in them, being deliberately purposed and planned. The size of an organization will depend on the extent of the consciousness of the need to be met. Thus for the highest intellectual and æsthetic and ethical pursuits but few are apt to be found; sometimes an individual has to remain alone with the sublimest ideals. But extensive associations can be formed on a basis where large masses move, as in material interests and industrial pursuits, in politics, and in various social and religious affairs.

The laws of association are so important because they may in a measure enable a man to forecast the future of an organization and to determine the probable course of events. These laws are especially worthy of study in our day of organizations. Among the most important laws is this: the consciousness of need which calls forth an organization is intensified by the organization itself. The supply the organization furnishes to the need is food for its development, just as the intellectual hunger is increased by the knowledge it devours. This is the usual process in a crisis. By means of organization the desires of conflicting parties are intensified and the inevitable crisis is hastened. Men under the thralldom of traditionalism deprecate discussion and agitation at such times; but if the crisis must come, the sooner it comes the better. If the tooth must come out, why endure the agony a whole week and then have it extracted with severer pain than would have been caused the first day? The development of tares may be but the process for their destruction.

Labor Organizations.

The labor organizations, which have become of such immense importance in our day, are, in their present form, of recent origin. The government in Europe was entirely in the hands of the pivileged classes, and

they prevented the combination of laborers in their own interest. Mr. Rogers tells us that in France, before the revolution, the peasant "bore all the burdens of the government, taxes in money, taxes in produce, taxes in blood, and was treated, as time went on, with increasing brutality and contempt." The masses were "robbed and cudgelled." Not permitted to organize, their only redress was revolution, the awful avenger of centuries of cumulative wrongs. But how was it in the freer England? The same author informs us that "the principle that the crown and the parliament should be employed in the interest of the landowner and the trader became stereotyped. . . . Laborers had ceased to be factors in political action and were simply ignored for a century or more." This refers to the period after the Restoration. Again he says: "The English government, till very recent times, having been administered by opulent landowners and successful traders, did its best to depress the condition of those who live by labor." The maximum wage was fixed by law for the workman, and he was punished if he asked for more, and the employer who gave him more was also punished. He says: "I contend that from 1563 to 1824, a conspiracy, concocted by the law and carried out by parties interested in its success, was entered into, to cheat the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the soil, to deprive him of hope, and to degrade him into irremediable poverty. . . . For more than two centuries and a half, the English law, and those who administered the law, were engaged in grinding the English workman down to the lowest pittance, in stamping out every expression or act which indicated any organized discontent, and in multiplying penalties upon him when he thought of his natural rights."* Not until 1824 were

* J. E. T. Rogers, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," II., 398.

labor organizations legally possible. "The laws directed against the right of workmen to combine together in order to sell their wages in the best market, which had lasted for nearly five centuries, were repealed in 1824." *

Reason for Labor Organizations.

Why did labor organizations spring into being, why have they continued, and how do we account for their increasing power? With the existing enlightenment and views of laborers they are a necessity. So far as the records of history go, there never was a nation or a period when the welfare of laborers could with safety have been committed to the ruling classes. If the wealthy were called to be the shepherds of the people, history proves that often even in Christian lands the sheep have been committed to the mercy of wolves. It may have been unconsciously, but self-interest has been too strong to enable the rich to be just to the poorer classes. The exceptions prove the rule. If the laborers were to be saved from the selfishness, the greed, the dominion, the insolence, and the brutality of aristocracy and wealth, it was only possible by means of the laws, or through the uprising of laborers and their resort to self-help. They are the best judges of their needs; and if they do not protect their own rights their doom is sealed. If laborers, however, remain isolated they are sure of defeat in every contest. But in union there is strength. If they combine they can fix the price at which their labor shall be sold; and this price is reduced only if their necessities force them or if others not in the organization underbid them or if employers cannot afford the wages demanded. The combination, therefore, tends to overcome the competition of laborers with one another and to make their contest with capital the most powerful.

---

* J. E. T. Rogers, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," II., 438.

The writer found that in England many laborers opposed an appeal to the law for the accomplishment of their end; they expected to attain it more directly and more effectively by combination.

On the laborers themselves the combinations have a marked effect. They are important means for developing them, for making them more fully conscious of their interests, for heightening the class consciousness and making laborers a solidarity. There is a strengthening effect in the class feeling produced and in the conviction that each is backed by all. A contagious influence is felt, and a community of views and aims is likely to prevail. While thus laborers as a class are elevated, labor also receives more respect. In important questions millions may move as a unit and become irresistible. Usually laborers are vastly in the majority, and to gain their just ends organization alone is needed. Not only is this combination important in conflicts with individual capitalists or with associations of them, but it can also become a great political force, such as the social democracy in Germany. In England the political tendency of the labor organizations is becoming more marked, and the same will be inevitable in America. They can then prevent legislation which unjustly discriminates against them. As a means of education they have an important mission. Sometimes the educational element is one of the special aims. Meetings are held for the discussion of subjects of interest and importance to the members, journals, reading rooms and lectures are established, and provision is made for means of recreation. In many instances they are also benevolent societies for the financial aid and the insurance of the members.

The Right of Labor Organizations.

The time is past when the right of laborers to combine for the purpose of considering and promoting their own interests can be questioned. The very exigencies of the case have made the organization of labor a necessity, and that organization would have to be instituted if it did not already exist. Self-protection and well-being are legitimate aims for all classes; why not for laborers, the ones most of all in need of them? Capitalists combine; gigantic rail road corporations are formed; trusts are everywhere created; employers of labor unite for the purpose of heightening their profits and increasing their dominion. Are laborers alone to be restrained in the exercise of their rights? It requires a satanic spirit for the strong to combine for the sake of keeping the weak from rising or of crushing them while down. As there is a fascination in the sublimity of a great battle which makes us forget the multitudes of the slain and the agony of the wounded, so we have in the past looked with a degree of wonder at gigantic frauds and robberies, while we found no attraction in the humbler walks of honesty. The worship of success has promoted succcess at any price, provided only it be on an enormous scale. A mawkish sentimentality on the part of communities actually threatens to rob the prison and the gallows of such as are guilty of the most revolting crimes. But a change is taking place in public sentiment. We now behold the slain of the awful battle and are absorbed by the terrible devastation. Our hearts go out more after those slain innocently than after the haughty victors. We are freeing ourselves from the thralldom of being overawed by syndicates, monopolies, landlordism, nabobs, and are turning toward the victims over which tyrants ascend their thrones. The mighty may be mightiest alone; but a hundred battling with fierce waves, each in a

frail bark and weak by himself, are liable to be lost, while if they build one solid vessel and man it they may be saved.

Labor united, so long as its cause is just and violence is avoided, can depend on the growing sympathy of the people. The masses are rapidly learning what interests they have in common, and every effort to overthrow oppression is recognized as their own cause. Honest, humane capital deserves and will more and more receive honor from organized labor; but capitalism as the yoke of a tyrant must be broken, and both aims are worthy of associations of workingmen. The enthusiastic hopes which laborers concentrate in their organizations are in many respects justifiable, but their realization will depend mainly on themselves. We must distinguish between the ideal and the reality; the idea embodied in the organization as the means for promoting the welfare of laborers deserves approval, but this does not imply that all the existing combinations are commendable. Unfortunately, many people do not distinguish between the ideal and the actuality, and consequently they favor or condemn indiscriminately, while what is needed is the approval of the organizations so far as right and the rejection of the wrong in them.

Evolution of Labor Organizations.

Our hope in these institutions consists mainly in the possibilities which they possess. In different lands the advanced laborers do not rest in the attainments made by their combinations, but they push forward to fulfill the prophecies which they discover in them. The development of these organizations is among the most important considerations in connection with the Social Problem. In every direction improvement is needed. Is it strange that laborers of different nationalities, of different degrees in education and in the standard of living,

and with the most heterogeneous notions about political economy and government and industries, should at first form a wild horde rather than a beautiful harmony? In the associations themselves they have to learn the value and power of organizations. What is at first mere instinct or unrestrained passion, will have to be disciplined and trained. The consciousness of laborers must be unfolded; brutal forces must be mastered; by working together in organizations the laborers must learn tolerance of differences, appreciation of conflicting views and interests, the sacrifice of selfishness and obstinacy, and adaptation to one another. Their uncurbed strength needs discipline respecting outsiders as well as toward the members. In the beginning numerous mistakes arise from ignorance, inexperience, and wilfulness; but the expensive lessons of experience teach them to consider others as well as themselves, and to adapt themselves to the situation in general and to particular emergencies as they arise. Institutions of the wisest and best men make blunders after flourishing for centuries; how then can we expect labor combinations in their childhood to be faultless, or to have such an unfailing wisdom as even the maturity of age lacks? Not that mistakes occur is ground for despair; but there is reason for blame if the lessons they teach are not learned.

Self-development is unquestionably the chief ground of hope. In some cases the growth in strength has been attended by a growth in excesses; but the inner evolution has also been very marked and hopeful. This has been true most of all in England. The organizations in the United States are more recent, their difficulties are peculiar, largely incident to our wide extent of territory and our foreign population, and various other conditions have promoted the disintegration of laborers. But progress has been made, much of it in the direction of a knowledge of

what ought not to be done. Here, where popular opinion is so omnipotent, success depends greatly on the sympathy of the community, and that depends mainly on the character of the organizations. Heretofore they have been too much affected by external distractions to concentrate effort on their own inner development; but its importance is too striking to be ignored; and there is strong reason to believe that it will henceforth receive more attention. Among the most important results to be effected is the promotion of discrimination among the laborers themselves. The English trade unions admit none addicted to intemperance. "They demand moderation, intelligence and experience." Among the important missions is the discrimination between the good and bad elements, the winnowing of the chaff from the wheat.

Labor has its noblemen and its rabble; and one of the direst curses resting on the noble consists in being perpetually classed with the worthless and the degraded. Has it not become intolerable to treat drunkards, idlers, paupers, hoodlums, the vicious and the criminals, as if all belonged to the ranks of labor? Perhaps they are nothing but shirks who never aspire to honest work and do not rise to the dignity of workmen; they may be drippings from the other classes, which ought to be held strictly responsible for them. Berlin has a Labor Colony in which needy men find employment for board and lodging, with the possibility of earning a pittance besides. About seven hundred are thus provided for annually. The name and the work performed make the impression that it is a refuge for laborers only; yet the majority are not day laborers. Those who seek shelter there have come from different classes, from the rich as well as the poor, so that landowners are represented, merchants, army officers, students, and the professions.

It is high time to stop the outrage of consigning to laborers such gentlemen as have never labored, but have percolated through the various social grades on account of idleness and incompetence, drink, debauchery, gambling, and crime. This insult can be wiped from labor by the organizations; they can draw the line between the knights of labor and the parasites; and by admitting to membership only the worthy, they can aid effectively the imperative process of distinguishing the upright laborers from the degraded class which constitutes the dregs of society.

In this inner evolution, intellectual and moral, we see the conditions for strengthening and perfecting the organizations and enabling them to accomplish their purpose. The very aim may need purification and enlargement, as much as these are required by the means for its attainment. The end does not justify the means. Just as laborers are not alone in the world, so their personal interests are not the sum and substance of human concerns. With the inner development the growth of labor organizations in numbers may be expected. Not until they become strong enough to control the labor market can they expect to accomplish their purpose. They ought to embrace all the worthy workmen of a place or at least a majority of them; and then the associations of the various places ought to be united in district, state, and national organizations. By thus making them something like the guilds of former times, real brotherhoods, a solidarity of worth, they may become the most powerful means for exalting laborers, dignifying their toil, and promoting their social welfare. These organizations have already ceased to be the concern exclusively of workingmen, and we may expect scholarship and means to be drawn more and more to consider their claims and need, and to lend a helping hand.

Strikes.

There is violence and violence. One kind makes the law, bends it to the purpose of the dominant classes, or outwits the law itself. History teems with this legal violence, and institutions teem with its injustice. This innocent crime is found in the highest places and clothes demons in the garb of saints. Then there is violence which resists righteous law, is diabolical in spirit, and hates the good because it is good. Besides this premeditated kind there is another which springs from despair, which is the result of injustice suffered, which leaps from sudden wrath, which finds justification, in its own estimation, because it wants to right wrongs and to crush oppression. We can explain this last form of violence without apologizing for it. It may be founded on ignorance, on a misinterpretation of grievances, and be thoroughly unjust. Laborers complain that they are driven to certain unlawful acts. This we understand; but would they have been driven if violence were not already an element in their character? The unconscious, helpless elements in times of great agitation deserve especial study, in order that the way to control them may be discovered. As the labor organizations are developed we look for the occasions of violence to be diminished and the violence itself to cease.

Not a word need be said here about Molly Maguires and destructive anarchistic associations; if violence or lawlessness becomes a principle, it is to be unconditionally condemned. But it is always wiser to go to the root of the evil than to end with censure. Why did the Molly Maguires commit murder, why do anarchists arise, and whence the riots and the destruction of property? Sup-

press the rebellion, but also the slavery which led to the rebellion.*

Labor unions can resort to various means to gain their end, but they ought to be legitimate. They can expose the evils to which laborers are subjected, and the exposure may mean their abolition. There are various methods for obtaining redress, and it cannot be denied that some are chosen hastily, amid excitement, under the impulse of passion, revenge, or despair. The most important aims sought are the following: to obtain an increase or prevent a reduction of wages; to decrease the hours of labor; to secure better treatment from employers, managers, superintendents, and foremen; to make the sanitary and other conditions of the factories and mines more favorable; and to secure the growth and dominance of the organizations themselves. Laborers in an establishment who have no ground for complaint may make the cause of suffering fellow-laborers their own and form a solidarity with them in redressing grievances. There is a strong and constantly

* How significant that in free America a secret organization like the Molly Maguires was possible! Is it prophetic? What drove those men to desperation and led them to burn property and commit murder? We quote Dr. Weideman in "American Federationist" Ap., 1897: "Remember here were seventy-five thousand men who united in the opinion that they had exhausted all the means in their hands to get the redress they sought, and with sober and quiet determination of soul settled down to the dreaded resolve to dare the very worst that they might, as they honestly believed, better their condition." Living in the region and familiar with the events, the Doctor declares that from the study of causes and effects, with a manly and even purpose to give right to every man, "it will be seen that the iron had sunk deep into the souls of these men and that in sheer despair they gave blow for blow and thrust for thrust in stern resolve to seek in the last resort the overthrow of a system that was slowly but surely grinding out the last vestige of manhood that was in them." The violence, for which the Doctor of course does not apologize, is thus described: "More than three hundred and fifty murders in three years in the Lackawanna, Schuylkill and Wyoming coal fields, and a strike that paralyzed the coal and iron business of the whole state of Pennsylvania for an entire summer, was a part of the mission of the dreaded order of 'The Mollie Maguires.'"

growing disposition on the part of laborers to make the cause of one the cause of all, not limiting the community of interests and the sympathies to a trade or even a nation, but the tendency is to make them international.

Among the means used to attain their end an effective one is the boycott, the ban being pronounced against certain firms and their products; the aim is to cripple these firms by refusing to purchase their goods. But the most common method is to resort to a strike, that is, to cease work. The capitalist can dismiss laborers whenever he pleases, provided no contract is violated. Laborers have the same right to lay down their work, unless forbidden by some contract. By preventing manufacture capital lies idle or actually decreases, and the customers of a firm, being obliged to purchase elsewhere, may be permanently lost. A strike is a two-edged sword; it sometimes injures the strikers as much as the capitalist or vastly more. The business of a place may be weakened or driven to another city, a result from which the laborers are likely to suffer equally with the capitalist. Idleness and demoralization are the usual attendants of strikes. Of the hundreds which occur annually in the United States many fail; in other cases, where success is attained, it may require years of toil before the increase of wages compensates for the pecuniary loss sustained by the laborers during their idleness. In a number of strikes the loss in wages amounted to millions, the loss to capitalists did so likewise, while the injury to trade, to the community, or the nation was incalculable. On the other hand, if the wages are raised or if the condition of the workmen is improved, the result may be permanent, the oppression and insolence and injustice of some brutal tyrant may be exposed and crushed, and the beneficial effect reaped by all laborers in a particular department, not merely by those immediately involved in the strike.

While thus the right to strike is admitted in the abstract, the expediency in a particular case is another matter. The possible good and the possible evil, the right and wrong, the advantages and disadvantages, must be carefully weighed. For one class or party with strong partisan feeling and representing the interests of but one side this is extremely difficult if not impossible. All interference with the rights of other laborers, of capitalists, of property or the community, must be condemned. The cause of justice never justifies injustice. The situation may be such that a strike seems to be demanded as the only way to secure the rights of laborers; but the situation is itself wrong if the conditions are such as to require strikes. The attention and discussion so generally devoted to strikes might be much better employed by considering the causes of strikes and by attempting to remove them.

Valuable material on this subject is found in the Third Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, on "Strikes and Lockouts." It is there shown that during the six years 1881–6 there occurred in the United States 3,902 strikes, involving 22,304 establishments and 1,323,203 employees. Of the laborers 518,583 were successful in the strikes, 143,976 partially so, while 660,396 failed. The assistance given to laborers suffering during this period from strikes and lockouts (160,823 being locked out) is reported at $4,430,595; but this is declared to fall much below the amount actually given. The total loss to employers through strikes and lockouts is put down at $34,163,814. Other losses, such as occurred to industries and communities, are declared to be beyond reasonable calculation. The total loss incurred by the Chicago strike has been estimated at $80,000,000.*

* Wright, "Industrial Evolution in the United States," 313.

Arbitration.

Frequently strikes run their natural course till one side or the other gives up the contest or until they come to an understanding without the intervention of a third party. The sentiment prevalent in a community is likely to exert much influence in determining what side shall win or what compromise shall be made. Laborers are usually at a disadvantage for the reason that they cannot live long without work, being dependent for support on their earnings or the contributions of friends and sympathizers. Roscher holds that "a strike which lasts six weeks is to be regarded as a failure;" this is, however, not necessarily the case. The frequency of strikes and the great evils and losses attending them have led to various schemes of conciliation and arbitration.

Without attempting any extended discussion, a plan is here proposed which has met with marked success in England. Two systems, named after their authors, Mundella and Kettle, have been in vogue. Being essentially alike, they are here combined so as to get the advantageous features of both. The aim is to prevent strikes by means of boards of conciliation and arbitration. After a strike has begun and passion and prejudice are aroused the conditions for arbitration are most unfavorable, each party regarding the inclination to yield as an evidence of weakness and of failure. It is therefore better to prevent such a development of the conflict as to reach a crisis. For this purpose a board of conciliation and arbitration is chosen, say annually, consisting of a number of men selected by the firm and an equal number by the laborers, perhaps twelve or eighteen in all. They can choose one of their own number chairman (the Mundella system), or they can select some outsider whose knowledge, impartiality and general fitness adapt him to the position, as the presiding officer (the Kettle system), without a vote, but with the privilege

of taking part in the discussion, and, if thought best, with the power of deciding points of dispute in case the board itself cannot come to an agreement. This board can meet quarterly, or more frequently if four or six members ask that it be called together. An executive committee in the meanwhile hears all complaints, and points which it cannot settle are submitted to the board. In this way complaints are heard and difficulties are considered so soon as they arise, and efforts are at once made to remove them. As the parties concerned are equally represented and meet on an equal footing, every subject can be considered from all sides and all claims can be duly weighed. A board of strangers may be impartial, but the conflicting parties are apt to hesitate to submit the decision to them, because unknown and because the fear is entertained that the merits of the case cannot be understood. There is at times also a hesitancy in giving strangers an insight into private industrial affairs. The board appointed by the parties concerned has an important educational element in bringing the two classes together on an equal footing for considering such affairs as mutually concern them. If a decision is not attained by the board and if the matter is not left to an impartial president, a new board of outsiders can be appointed, or the final appeal can be made to a state board of arbitration. Legal enactments can make the decision reached binding; but as the parties contract with each other to submit all disputed points to this board, and as the sentiment of the community naturally favors its decision, the intervention of the law is not apt to be required. This admirable system has sufficient pliability to adapt it to various localities and conditions. Here only the principles are given; the details can be arranged as the peculiarities of the situation require. Communities are naturally disposed to complain if they suffer from a strike, and the mere fact

of the strike is apt to engross their attention more than the causes which have led to it. These complaints are not well founded so long as the communities themselves do nothing toward the establishment of equitable relations between labor and capital, and so long as the law leaves it to capitalists and laborers to fight out matters which our legislative bodies ought to settle.

So important are these subjects that we add a summary of the discussion of labor organizations and strikes.

1. There ought to be no necessity for laborers to combine in order to secure their rights. The state, society, and capital ought to insist that labor shall receive the full reward of its toil, and that the best possible conditions shall be furnished the laborers for the welfare and culture of themselves and their families.

2. So long as these conditions are not furnished, laborers have the right and duty to combine for the purpose of attaining those interests which can be secured only by such combination. If capital makes self-interest and competition its supreme law, then labor is obliged to combine for its own protection.

3. The relations of labor and capital ought to be more specifically defined by law, so that justice may prevail and no dominant power or party be permitted to enslave the weaker. If might is right, then in a republic the victory must eventually be on the side of the majority, namely, the laboring classes.

4. Capitalistic monopolies which are the product of injustice and violence, which promote the excessive concentration of wealth, which destroy the middle class, and which tend to make the enslavement of labor perpetual, must be made impossible. The advantages of these monopolies so far as they lessen the cost of production ought to be secured in connection with a better distribution

of wealth. The benefits of monopoly ought to accrue to society at large, especially to the laborers, and not to a few monopolists.

5. The combination of laborers ought to be guarded and limited by legal enactments, just as the combination of capital. The law should protect labor organizations in their rights, but should prevent all wrong and violence and anarchy.

6. Labor organizations have their proper sphere in protecting labor by legitimate means. But they become dangerous if they assume functions which belong to all classes of society, not merely to laborers, if they enslave their own members or tyrannize over a minority, or treat as felons such laborers as do not belong to the organizations. The evils connected with labor organizations in the past can be overcome only by the development of the organizations themselves, and by determining more exactly their legal limits. If society grants rights to these organizations, society must also protect itself against their wrongs.

7. Strikes ought to become unnecessary by making labor and capital mutualistic instead of antagonistic. Labor and capital are inherently co-operative, not destructive of one another. The dependence of these two on each other must determine the relation existing between capitalists and laborers. It must be emphasized that not labor and capital, but laborers and capitalists are at war. Strikes will become impossible so soon as both parties become partners instead of enemies in industrial pursuits.

8. Strikes ought to be the last resort in the effort of laborers to secure their right. In many cases they are a much greater injury to laborers and the community at large than to the employers against whom they are aimed. Strikes depend for their success largely on the sympathy of

the community; but this is forfeited if the strike is wilful, unjust, or destructive.

9. The best means for preventing strikes under the existing economic system is by means of Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration. These should be voluntary, consisting of an equal number of capitalists and laborers, or their representatives, with equal rights to both parties. The contract between capital and labor must be made on condition that points of dispute shall be submitted for settlement to this board. If the board cannot agree, it can appoint another board or committee to which the final appeal shall be made. While the board is voluntary, its decisions can be made binding by legal enactments.

10. By regular meetings of such a board difficulties may be settled as they arise and thus strikes prevented. If strikes nevertheless occur, the board may arbitrate. But if the employer and the employed contract together to submit to this board all points in dispute, and are true to their contract, strikes will become impossible. Such boards of conciliation and arbitration will serve to bring capitalists and laborers nearer each other, will develop the feeling that they are dependent on each other and must co-operate, and will substitute mutual counsel and help in place of antagonism and class interest and class passion.

Organizations for Industrial Co-operation.

Many of the difficulties in the industrial situation are due to the antagonism and conflict between capitalists and laborers. If evils are inherent in the social system, they are aggravated by the class warfare now waged. Social progress and national welfare depend on the removal of the causes of the war. The interests now in conflict must be harmonized. Why should capitalists and laborers form two hostile hosts, when in reality they are but different corps of the same great

industrial army? Being mutually dependent, capital and labor ought to be made mutualistic and co-operative in all their relations and activities. If a man claims that he can do what he pleases with his money, and that his business is his own and therefore subject solely to his control, he may meet with laborers who claim that their strength is their own, and that they will sell and use it as they please. Such claims might do for the Middle Ages; now they are antiquated. As we have seen, capital, business, and labor have social as well as private functions; society makes them possible and valuable, and has something to say with respect to their use. A man can do with his business as he pleases only so long as the community sees fit to let him. The extremely individualistic principle makes selfishness supreme. If made the principle of the good man, why not equally so of the most insolent and brutal? It reduces the question of capital and labor to the problem of might; and where might is to solve the problem it is hard to understand how violence and revolution can be avoided. Capitalism has an enormous advantage and may use it for the purpose of perpetuating its dominion; but by the evolution of labor organizations this dominion is seriously threatened. If capital can tyrannize labor, why not labor capital so soon as it gains the ascendancy?

The question now to be answered is, how can labor and capital be so organized as to become mutualistic and co-operative? So long as the laborer is merely a wage-earner, while the total product of labor goes to the capitalist, this will be impossible, unless some just proportion between the wage and the product is established. Such a wage would make the laborer in a measure a partner in the enterprise. A partnership of some kind is essential; capitalists and laborers are in reality partners in the sense that they must co-operate in order to make production possible.

Among the most important problems now presented is such a relation between the two that each one shall have that share in the product which is his due. The product to one, a wage to another, will make the one intent chiefly, if not solely, on the product, the other on the wage. Cannot both parties have a more direct interest in the product than is now the case? Some form of co-operation in the result is needed; that is, capital and labor produce together, and they must share together in the product. If the capitalists are at the same time the laborers, then there is no difficulty about the matter; capital and labor are united and both share in the product.

Where laborers form co-operative associations and all the products belong to them, they cease to be mere wage-earners by becoming product-earners as well as creators. Such productive co-operative societies have been tried; some have been successful while others have failed. The results thus far attained give no final decision as to the possibilities and advantages of co-operation. A far more thorough trial is needed. Laborers themselves require more preparation, especially for the management. They must learn to cast aside envy and jealousy when superior authority and pay are given to superior ability in controlling the affairs of a manufacturing establishment. Co operation both in production and distribution has been tried in England, on the Continent, and in America, and may be advantageously extended.

Various forms of co-operation between capital, intellect and labor are also possible. Profit sharing is another form of co-operation. This is of course not possible in the case of servants and others engaged in labor which yields no profit. By giving the laborer a share in the profit he has a personal concern in the work. It ceases to be mere drudgery for a wage. He has an interest in saving tools,

in using the raw materials to the best advantage, in giving the greatest value to the product, in making his own labor most effective, and in seeing to it that the other workmen do their part faithfully. It tends not only to improve the labor but also the character of the laborer. A personal concern in all that pertains to the business becomes a personal educator; it exalts a man, increases his independence, and makes his labor more important in his own eyes. A new responsibility involves a new mission. The inestimable importance of these various elements becomes apparent so soon as the culture of men is esteemed more important than the accumulation of things. There are difficulties in the way; the greatest are in men. Where antagonism has prevailed confidence cannot at once be established in suspicious minds. It is not possible, perhaps, to determine the best method of profit sharing without much experience, or to fix the just amount in the sharing without many trials. If the treatment of laborers or their past experience has made them suspicious, they may insist on prying into matters which do not concern them. Another serious difficulty is the one mentioned above—capitalists are prone to regard their business as a private affair which they can manage as they please; and profit sharing is not their pleasure. They may fear interference with what they regard as solely their affair. Then, if profits are shared should not the losses be shared likewise? The laborer must have a regular income; the profit he shares must be added to his wage. If now losses occur, they might take away his livelihood if obliged to share them. Laborers, clerks, salesmen, employees of all kinds, might be well off in times of prosperity, and starve in times of adversity. These difficulties must be considered and met, and this requires time and experience. For the various forms of co-operation and profit sharing there is probably a great future. The sphere for their successful

operation is among choice capitalists and choice laborers. Evolution here is greatly needed and very hopeful. Co-operation is a most important factor in the solution of the Social Problem; but taken by itself it cannot furnish the solution, which some have expected it to give.

No general rule for the formation of co-operative societies and industrial partnerships can be given; the matter must be left to the men and to circumstances. These forms of co-operation have certain ideals which deserve the utmost efforts at realization. Repeated attempts have been made to secure the help of the state in establishing productive co-operative societies; but it is clear that the co-operators will have to rely mainly on themselves. For large enterprises laborers lack the capital; even for smaller ones they may need money as well as credit. All institutions which will loan them money at reasonable interest, not as charity but on purely business principles, are to be welcomed. They will help to destroy the occupation of the sharks who devour the needy because of their needs. Co-operation on a moderate scale may be possible in various industries; the excellence of the work of the co-operators may enable them to compete with larger establishments. The difficulty of obtaining steam power is not insuperable; there may be opportunities in different places for securing, at moderate cost, whatever is needed by any number of workmen. If a number of small co-operative establishments buy the raw material at wholesale, they can have the same advantage in this respect as the large firms. As laborers themselves develop, the more enterprising are likely to resort more and more to such co-operative efforts in order to become both workmen and capitalists.

The opportunities are great; perhaps experience only is required to accomplish in a large measure by means of voluntary co-operation what the social democrats expect

from their socialistic state. The vast improvements in the modes of production ought to be shared more equally by capitalist and laborer; and no more effective way of accomplishing this seems possible than by uniting capitalist and laborer in one and the same person. Co-operation, as stated above, will not solve the Social Problem; but in connection with other forces it may be one of the most efficient agencies in the solution. With this productive co-operation the distributive co-operation can be connected. Stores managed by laborers, all the profits going to them as shareholders, have been exceedingly valuable in England. They too seem to have the promise of a great future.

In industrial partnerships or profit-sharing there are also great possibilities, though, as indicated, the difficulties are serious. But in numerous cases there may be a percentage, even if all the laborers do not share in it, as for special faithfulness or efficiency or skill. If there is no direct increase in pay, there may be a certain sum for insurance or a fund can be created for the use and benefit of the laborers. It is not too near an approach to the millennium to expect that, even without a positive agreement, a firm unusually prosperous during a year shall in some form make those who have co-labored with them sharers in the prosperity. Thus some per cent. of the profits might be invested for the employed, it being understood that this is purely voluntary on the part of the capitalist, not demanded by the contract; or it might be used for reading rooms and other means of improvement, or for recreation. Such arrangements will be in the interest of the employers as well as of the employed; both parties will be benefitted by the means which bring them nearer each other and develop the mutualistic elements. A humane personal relation is the most effective way of overcoming the present danger-

ous strain between capitalists and laborers. Another side is important: long enough have we heard that labor is benefitted by making profits large; it is time to emphasize that capital is benefitted and rendered more secure by making the compensation of labor large. By raising their standard of living the efficiency of laborers is increased, and their elevation will be a benefit to the whole social organism. Their prosperity will enable them to spend more, will increase the circulation of money, and raise the value of commodities. Every rational view, however much it may rejoice in the welfare of the few, must behold in the well-being of the many the chief evidence of national prosperity and national safety.

Organizations for Co-operative Study and Work.

There is room for numerous new organizations and many will no doubt spring up in the near future. No one can foretell what ones will arise, nor can we give a view of all that are demanded. So urgent, however, is one need that the most zealous efforts to meet it should be made. It is clear that capitalists cannot solve the problem. They are not free from class prejudice; they cannot get out of themselves and their limitations; with the best of intentions they cannot put themselves in the place of laborers and appreciate their feelings and needs. Neither can laborers solve the problem. They cannot master the theories involved; they cannot put themselves in place of the capitalists; they would make their needs, their views, their prejudices the means for solving the problem. In either case the solution is that of a class and necessarily partial. But we must have a social solution of the Social Problem, not a mere partisan solution. We need impartial investigators, men who are specialists, who rise above all partisan considerations, and in their search for truth judge every subject according to

the merits of the case. There are specialists to whom the subject-matter is everything, who belong to neither of the conflicting parties and yet study, unbiased, the interests of both. We have also called attention to the numerous other students and professional men whose calling puts them into relations with both capitalists and laborers, and of whom we have a right to expect equal fairness to both classes. Far more necessary at the present juncture than the evolution of the existing organizations is the evolution of that spirit which will bring the different parties together. As we have neither the knowledge nor the disposition required for the solution of our problem, both must yet be developed. Now, we need an organization of capitalists and laborers and students and professional men, so as to bring all the classes together on an equal footing and with equal rights, for the purpose of representing and discussing all views, the aim being to co-operate in the study of the Social Problem and in working for its solution.

With the present antagonism and class prejudice only very limited organizations of this kind are possible; but even if small, their need is apparent, their influence would be felt, and their growth would likely be rapid and great. They would overcome the partisan class spirit now in their way. Their existence would imply a subordination of class and party to the truth and the right. If the good is so loved that it becomes the strongest tie, it will draw and knit together men of all classes; it will put a new class of the good in place of the various classes now united by selfish interest. It is startling when it dawns on the mind how the bonds of union in the nations are being severed. For patriotism we have parties; instead of religious unity there is sectarian contention; in place of a community of principles and ideas we find the dominance of conflicting classes and selfish interests; in some countries, as the United

States, there is not even unity in race and nationality, but disintegration and antagonism, if not anarchy. Whoever weighs these facts according to their actual value must see the dangers which lurk in the nations. Instead of absorption by the atomizing, disintegrating, repellent tendencies, we need the evolution of those deeper, higher, and more momentous concerns which underlie and transcend these tendencies; the supreme concerns which unify, which are common to all, and which make the centripetal unity stronger than the centrifugal diversity.

Literature.

The books on labor organizations by Schulze-Gævernitz and Ely have been mentioned. George Howell, "Trade Unionism New and Old," Methuen & Co., London. Trant, "Trade Unions," Kegan Paul. Brentano, "History of Gilds and Trade Unions," Kegan Paul. See especially, "History of Trade Unionism," by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Longneanns.

Gilman, "Profit Sharing Between Employer and Employee," Houghton and Mifflin. Benjamin Jones, "Co-operative Production," Clarendon Press, Oxford. B. Potter, "The Co-operative Movement in England," Sonnenschein. Boehmert, "*Die Gewinnbeteiligung*," Zurich. On the general subject of industrial organization see Marshall, "Principles of Economics," Macmillan, Vol. I., Book IV., Chapters VIII. to XIII. Thornton's book on "Labor" discusses in Book IV. Industrial Partnership, Co-operative Stores, and Co-operative Societies.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOLUTION BY EVOLUTION—CONCLUDED.

3. EVOLUTION OF THE CHURCH. 4. INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION.

3. Evolution of the Church.

There are regions where a hint that the church may need evolution is regarded as a want of loyalty, if not as evidence of infidelity. It is not deemed possible that the deepest love for the church need not make one blind to its faults, that this love is anxious to develop the church to the utmost perfection, and that it may be convinced that judgment must begin at the house of God. Some fail to discern that between a stagnant ecclesiastical conservatism and a revolutionary radicalism lies genuine religious progress, a beautiful union of the conservative and the radical elements. Many insist that only the old Gospel preached in the old way is needed; and likely they mean by the old Gospel their own traditional dogmas which have been substituted for the real Gospel. They forget that during this very preaching the Social Problem assumed its present vast proportions and a materialistic socialism gained its multitude of adherents. The church as it is does not and cannot meet the demands made on it by the age. Whatever a vivid imagination may make of its invisible unity, the church is so distracted by sects that no imagination can behold in it the visible kingdom of God on earth, in which believers are one as a body or a temple is one. This unity is now needed in order to do the required effective work. The old Gospel is needed, but it must really be *the* Gospel, with its Christ who was the love He

taught and who lived the love He was, with its lesson of human brotherhood, its spirit of sympathy for the needy, its helpfulness for the neighbor as taught in the story of the Good Samaritan. A pernicious effect has been produced on the church by an abstract spiritualism, which treated man as a disembodied spirit in another realm rather than as a union of soul and body in this physical world. Jesus Christ favored no ghostly religion; his concern was with both soul and body as one organism, and he labored to save them as united. The church, however, has often treated the body and its earthly environment as no concern of its divine mission, thinking it a duty to divorce from the body that soul to which God has united it, and to save the soul no matter what might be the fate of its physical conditions.

Never can too much emphasis be placed on man's spirit, but the spirit must be taken in its actuality, not as an abstraction; and never can too much stress be laid on the spirit of Christ, but that spirit must be put into all the relations of man, as Christ did. All the glory that belongs to the church cannot make it more than one of the many factors for the solution of our problem, whatever importance may be given it compared with other agencies. Jesus taught that to Cæsar must be given what belongs to Cæsar, and to God what belongs to God. We are out of the Middle Ages, at least some are; and theology as a single member of the great organism of thought is more powerful than the assumption that it is the universe of thought.

Christian Sociology.

There are rich sociological elements in the New Testament, showing the relations and duties of men in their associated capacity. There the social principles of Christianity are found, and these need but be developed in order to obtain a system of Christian society. In 1880 the writer published

a book on *Christian Sociology*; this first use of the term Christian Sociology was regarded by theologians with suspicion for the reason that sociology had been monopolized mainly by writers who rejected or ignored Christianity. Now that the term Christian Sociology has been extensively adopted as designating a very valuable department of thought objection to its use comes from such as want only a secular sociology. This objection might be more valid if there were a scientific secular sociology, or if there were agreement with respect to the definition and sphere of sociology. The use now made of the term sociology does not require its limitation to society as developed by physical laws. Such a limitation is required only by those who recognize no other laws than those of physics. Sociology begins with a prejudice and with dogmatism if it determines beforehand what laws have made society. So far as it is truly scientific it will begin without this bias, will take society as it is, and will adopt whatever facts and laws it discovers in the process of its development. A sociology that has no place for Christianity is not complete. Sociology never can be a science in the sense in which chemistry is a science; it would be better to call it a philosophy or a system of society.

By prefixing Christian we confine the investigation to a particular kind of society, and we define Christian Sociology as the philosophy of Christian society, or as the system of that society which is controlled by Christian principles. It aims to describe this society; to explain its origin, nature, laws, relations, and purposes. It is a department of the general philosophy of society, just as state socialism is a department within socialism in general. One might as well say that chemistry is not a natural science because it is not the total science of nature, as to say that the philosophy of Christian society is not a sociological philosophy

because it is not the whole of sociology. We must recognize the Christian Sociology which is found in the New Testament, develop its principles and laws, and apply its teachings. Among the chief needs of the day is an emphasis on the biblical view of society. In the first three Gospels this society is usually designated the kingdom of God; in the fourth its most apt figure is that of the vine and the branches; in the language of Paul the body and members represent it most fully; and in the Epistle of James the second chapter, and the doctrine of faith and works, are very significant for the practical character of Christian society. We are justified in saying that the New Testament contains a doctrinal and ethical system of Christian society which needs recognition and development. Christian theology is not isolated; it puts all thought under contribution, and uses philosophy, science, history and literature, for its purposes: so Christian Sociology does not isolate itself, but uses all appropriate thought from all departments, especially from secular sociology. One who grasps the sociological principles of Scripture and the social needs of the age, can hardly question that the day for Christian Sociology is dawning.

The Rich and the Poor.

Bishop Ketteler of Mayence, who devoted much study to the Social Problem, emphasized the special duty of the church to the poorer members of society. He declared that the very vow of the Catholic priest makes it his duty to have special regard for the needy. It is true that from the pope to the humblest priest and the various orders of the Catholic church great efforts have been made to meet the demands springing from the labor agitations of the day and the various socialistic movements. In Protestant Germany it is admitted that the Catholics in that country have more effectually resisted the revolutionary socialistic tendencies

than the Evangelical church. Valuable lessons are taught by the experience of Christians in Germany and by the social trend in other lands. The common people require more attention, the church ought to recognize its special mission to the masses, and if it really has salt that preserves and sweetens, it must apply that salt to the most needy, as was done by Christ and the early church. The professed Christianity of the day has not escaped the contagion of the materialism of the times. Things are placed above persons, wealth is lord, and capital has gained dominion in religious affairs similar to that which prevails in politics. There are preachers, churches, and institutions which are so dependent on wealth that an exposure of the corruptions of riches would seem like a thrust at their benefactors. Where this state of things exists the church is not free; it cannot explain without risk of offence certain passages from the prophets, from Jesus, and from the apostles; it is felt that men of means from whom gifts are expected must be conciliated; and often the reign of the class spirit interferes seriously with the social efficiency of the church. These are the things which alienate workingmen and rob them of that enthusiasm for the church which so many manifest for the name and social teachings of Jesus.

It is notorious that there are churches in which there is no place for the poorer classes, where the rented pews, the contrast with their own dress, the aristocratic air and the general bearing of the congregation, convince them that they are not welcome. Perhaps the sermon is as unsympathetic to them as is the congregation; and it is no wonder that they are not attracted by a preacher whose reputation for zealous attention to the rich is equal to his reputation for the neglect of the poorer members of his flock. The church is the very institution to overcome the class spirit; if it, however, fosters it instead, the fate of

ancient Pharisaism will be its desert. It is hard to conceive of any thing more despicable than an institution which excludes the poor and yet calls itself a church of Jesus Christ. What a lesson is taught Protestantism by the Catholic church, in which rich and poor sit together, and kneel at the same altar! If the mission which so eminently belongs to the church is not done by it, ought not other voluntary agencies or associations to take its place? Even a movement once so generally treated with ridicule as the Salvation Army may accomplish what the church ought to do and yet admits that it cannot do. A better day will dawn when the church takes the lead in forming such a co-operative organization of all classes for study and work as was mentioned above. Its relation to all classes makes the union of all the good for social study and co-operation peculiarly its mission. The church, as no other voluntary agency, can bring together the employer and the employed, the rich and the poor, the educated and the illiterate; and in performing this task may consist much of its best work in the present crisis.

The friend of the church who welcomes just criticism as the condition for improvement will eagerly repel false accusations. The church may be as guiltless of the faults of an individual member as were the eleven disciples of the guilt of Judas, and the apostles of the hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira. Even in the richest churches there are pulpits which give no uncertain sound respecting the responsibilities and abuses of wealth. Many preachers are deeply interested in the Social Problem and eagerly study it in order to get the best light for the treatment of social themes in the pulpit. Respecting this problem enormous difficulties beset the church. These must be known and faced. The charge of cowardice, so often made against the church and its ministers, must be repelled; and there is no

way of repelling it but by preaching and living the whole Gospel of Christ respecting the rich and the poor. But it must also be remembered that this is by no means the only momentous theme of the Gospel.

Societies of the Church.

The numerous societies which have sprung up in the church, especially among the young men and women, are a hopeful sign of life and energy. Some of them are doing mission work at home or abroad; but it is evident in many places that the interest is so concentrated on the demands of Asia and Africa that the vast mission fields in our great centres of population are overlooked. University Extension and Settlements are usually Christian in character and admirably adapted to the task here advocated; but they are too isolated, enlist too few workers, and as the only earnest effort in various places to bring the different classes into living and working contact they are a sad commentary on the interest of the scholarly classes in the condition of the needy. Whatever the existing associations may do now for bringing together the members and classes of society, it is to be hoped that the special needs of the times will inspire the Christian enthusiasm of young believers to associate for the specific purpose of bringing about this desirable end. An extension of the existing Christian associations to the neglected sections of the cities might do great good; it would no doubt more than compensate for the removal of the down town churches which lose their divine calling in their original locality so soon as aristocracy and fashion and respectability move up town. In its grand Inner Mission Germany sets a Christian example to the churches of other lands. It is the aim of this important movement, by means of voluntary agencies, largely of laymen, to meet the physical, intellectual, and spiritual needs of the neglected and submerged classes. The Christian spirit animates the

whole movement, though the evangelistic element is by no means always predominant. The deaconess work is a large part of the undertaking. Sufferings of all kind are relieved, regardless of the spiritual results. It is just such comprehensive work for the whole man, conducted on Christian principles and properly organized, which our cities and also our country districts need. Preachers, physicians, lawyers, all would find their sphere in the undertaking, for all kinds of needs are to be met. But lasting organizations are needed, not spasmodic spurts of superficial enthusiasm.

How shall we reach the masses? How shall we get access to laborers to let them know that we are interested in their struggles? These questions are asked in our great cities. They contain a two-fold revelation: they show that the masses are not in the churches, at least not in the Protestant, and that the preachers are not in sympathetic contact with laborers, and they also indicate that there is an awakening on the part of the church with respect to its duty to those in the humbler walks of life. What can be more significant than that the aristocratic Unitarianism of Boston is taking to the Common on Sunday afternoons to preach to the masses in the hope of winning the people! *

---

* Since the above was written an important document on the relation of laborers to the church has appeared. It is by Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, and was published in the *American Federationist* for August, 1896. Two questions were submitted to him by a preacher. The first is: "What reason would be given by your associates, who do not attend church, for their absence from church?" Mr. Gompers answers: "My associates would answer that the spirit now dominating our churches is no longer in touch with their hopes and aspirations; that the churches have no sympathy with the real causes of the misery or severe burdens which the workers have to bear; that the pastors and ministers have no conception of the workers' rights denied them and wrongs borne by them, or, should they have the conception and knowledge, they have not the courage to publicly proclaim it from their pulpits; and the means and methods which my associates have by experience learned to be particularly successful in maintaining their rights and securing improved conditions—i. e., organization of the trade unions—have

4. Industrial Evolution.

Under the head of the organization of laborers, and of laborers and capitalists, we have already considered some elements of industrial evolution, such, namely, as are found in productive and distributive co-operation and in profit sharing. Numerous other forms of evolution are possible. In this era of fermentation great industrial activity is manifested and rapid changes are taking place; yet we can form no conception of the many resources of the present method of production and distribution. We are sure that without special study no one is prepared to believe what radical transformations are in progress. Some of these are due to the development of machinery, to the increase of inventions, and to the improvement in transportation by means of rail roads and steamships, bringing the country to the cities and making one great market of the world. But the present system of individualism and competition is also in process of transformation. Has it outlived itself and is it for that reason trying to get to a higher stage of evolution?

A strong effort is made to overcome the competition between capitalists, and this is in some cases successful.

---

been generally frowned down upon with contempt, treated indifferently or openly antagonized by ministers and the apparently staunch supporters of the church.

"The church and laborers have drifted apart, because the latter have always had their attention directed to the 'sweet by and by,' to the utter neglect of the conditions rising from the bitter now and now.

"The reason my associates would further give for their non-attendance at church would be that they have come to look upon the church and ministry as the apologists and defenders of the wrongs committed against the interests of the people, simply because the perpetrators are the possessors of wealth, who manifest little fear that it will be more difficult for them to enter the kingdom of heaven than it is for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle—whose real god is the *almighty dollar*, and who contribute a few of their idols to suborn the intellect and eloquence of the divines, and make even their otherwise generous hearts callous to the sufferings of the poor and

Combinations of capital are formed in order to destroy competition by means of co-operation. Thus capitalists unite, not merely to destroy competition with one another, but also with others not in the combination. This is the meaning of monopolies, trusts, syndicates, by which competitors are to be "crushed" and the control of the respective industries to be put exclusively in the hands of the combined parties. Not less marked is the effort to overcome competition among laborers. This is done by means of trade unions, which seek to promote the common interests by combination and co-operation. Thus organized labor faces the army of organized or unorganized capital.

Another step has already been taken, namely, an effort to overcome the conflict between capitalists and laborers. This is done in profit sharing, in every system which, besides the wage or in place of it, gives the workman a share in the profits of the enterprise; it is accomplished also where the laborer is likewise the capitalist and the owner of the product of the labor, as is the case in the various co-operative societies. This development of competition itself so as to get beyond competition is the beginning of a new era; it may cause confusion and promote antagonism at first, but it is a process in the direction of organization

---

struggling workers, so that they may use their exalted positions to discourage and discountenance all practical efforts of the toilers to lift themselves out of the slough of despondency and despair."

To the second question: "What remedies would you propose to bring your associates into closer touch with the church?" he answers:

"I would say a complete reversal of the present attitude, as indicated in my answer to your first question, would, perhaps, be most likely productive of the results you desire."

Mr. Gompers claims that laborers delight to hear preachers who sympatize with them, and closes with these words:

"He who fails to sympathize with the movement of labor; he who complacently or indifferently contemplates the awful results of present economic and social conditions is not only the opponent of the best interests of the human family, but is *particeps criminis* to all wrong inflicted upon the men and women of our time, the children of to-day, the manhood and womanhood of the future."

and socialization. The dogmatic revolutionary party sees in this tendency the final judgment on individualism and a prophecy of the triumph of socialism; but as socialism is the reaction against an extreme individualism, so will individualism react against an extreme socialism and prevent its final triumph. The individual and society both have rights, and these must be equally respected. We follow the transformations now taking place, we study their meaning and trend, we behold in them an evidence that the existing system is no petrifaction but alive, and we cherish the hope that the change will be so thorough as to remove the ills and meet the demands of the individual and society. We have clearly enough shown that we are not afraid of revolution if it is the outcome of the best evolution.

The Change Needed.

One who cherishes the modern ideas and contrasts them with the existing institutions is startled by the incongruity. We catch the breezes of the new world, but in many instances our institutions strike their roots in, and bear the fruits of, the Middle Ages or even of remote antiquity. We emphasize *men*, and then speak of this as the age of steam and machinery and inventions, and forget the men. Who would not rejoice in the marvelous development of *things?* But our interest is mainly centred in those who handle the machinery and ought to reap the benefits of the inventions. Everywhere the attention is absorbed by the principle of utility in production; but we are not less concerned about the principles of distribution and the beneficiaries of the process. Human beings are the solar centre of every ideal industrial system. At the basis of industrial evolution we put an idea that is cherished but does not receive the prominence and force it deserves. We insist on transferring the emphasis from things to persons, from possessions to their possessors, from machines to their attendants.

We protest that men do not exist for capital, but that capital exists for men. Much of the law, even in republics, treats houses and land and mines and money and cattle as the supreme concerns to which human beings are subordinate attachments. No revolution in history is comparable to that which would occur in the United States if manhood and womanhood were to occupy the throne on which filthy lucre reigns.

Property has been made the corner stone of states and pronounced the grand basis of government; we venture to reject this modern heathenism, and to substitute the ethical truth that personality is the divine and human basis of government, and that property is attached to the personality as bark is to the tree. In other words, the man possesses but is not possessed. Formerly property or rank was the representative in the English Parliament and House of Lords, as well as in the councils of state on the Continent; the parliamentarian might be a knave or fool, the essential element being the thing he represented, not what he was. In some modern countries such barbaric notions are theoretically exploded, and a few of the most advanced citizens hold that men in legislative bodies should represent men, not mere things, and occasionally men can be found to represent men. If heretofore the environment has been exalted as supreme, it is dawning on some now that its value consists in the person it environs. Capital and labor are the axes around which parties revolve; but put capitalists and laborers instead, and you will have the single axis "man," and but the one class "humanity" to revolve around it. The basal change of which we speak involves the whole system of ethics and likewise that of economics.

Social Claims.

A change in relations is required like that which Copernicus introduced into the solar system, and Kant in the mental world. Man comes first, man is the centre; yet not as a mere individual but as associated do we try to fix his place. Not only have we the hopeful sign that men are thinking on social subjects, but also that they are adopting new principles for the conduct of life. Heretofore the individual has been in the foreground and society, almost invisible, in the background; but now society comes to the front, and the individual is its constituent factor and not separated from it as an independent atom. The neglected social claims are asserting themselves and demanding their rights. Not only are we thinking of society, we are training children for it in order to overcome the prevailing selfishness; theories are advanced which show that if left to himself the individual is but a barbarian, but that in society he becomes civilized and complete; the laws turn more and more to social affairs in order to put men and classes into proper relations; in all individual interests we are discovering social elements, even the most private concerns of a person having some relation to his position and influence in society.

This social trend is also affecting all industrial pursuits. Theoretically we know that a farm, a factory, capital, labor, railroads, business, commerce, have social significance, and it only remains to put the theory into practice. A strong process of socialization is at work; it is in fact becoming more and more the dominant tendency. It is being discovered that civilization means socialization, the arranging of men in civil communities, ordering individuals in society, giving them their proper place as members of the organism, making them efficient in it, and thus lifting and enlarging the personal so as to be most truly social. The

process now going on, expanding the individual to a social personality, is destined to effect all the social relations. Soon every man who neglects the social claims will be ignored or punished by society, and he must necessarily be a greater sufferer than society through the neglect of his social duties.

Organic Relations.

Specialization has characterized the age in the deeper departments of thought and increased thoroughness and efficiency. This division of labor in intellectual pursuits has been similar to that which took place in the industries. In both departments a divisive and disintegrating tendency prevailed; men and themes and operations which belonged together were separated, and forces which needed each other for efficiency—as seed and soil, as cause and effect, were treated as antagonistic and destructive. Thus philosophy and science, science and religion, matter and spirit, have been antagonized, just as has been the case with capital and labor, with capitalists and laborers. There is a reaction against this now; where separation has prevailed an effort is now made to unite, to organize, and thus to insure completeness. It is discovered that fragments are not temples and that repellent atoms do not constitute a cosmos. The organic relations of thought are sought; connections are discovered where formerly only distinctions were seen; thus a process of articulation and organization is proceeding so as to make a unity of diversity.

This deep trend toward organization is affecting the industrial and social relations. There is war now; but war exists for the sake of peace, and peace will undoubtedly be achieved. Brave men who face each other in battle array learn to know and to respect one another. Any kind of personal contact is more instructive than the contact of things with things. "Every beginning is difficult," says

the German proverb; but "the beginning is half the end." The beginning for organization and co-operation and unification in industries, as well as in intellectual pursuits, has been made; by this beginning some of the greatest difficulties have already been overcome; and the progress henceforth may be expected to be more rapid. Not that we are now to dispense with the division of labor in the industries any more than with scholarly specialization; not that earnest competition is now to yield to personal indifference. The division of labor is to make the organization of the industries the more perfect, and competition is to be an element in co-operation, just as scholarly specialization is to increase the total scholarship and to promote the most perfect organism of thought. In business co-operation and industrial partnerships there is room for competition and a necessity for division of labor. When different parts are organized into a harmonious system the parts are not destroyed, but their efficiency is increased by putting them into their true relations and giving them their proper functions. The divisions and ranks in an army are for the sake of increasing its efficiency.

Industrial Organization.

In the present industries certain limbs are broken or dislocated; they must be set and healed; muscles are torn; they must be knit together again. Fractures, ruptures, everywhere; disorganization, antagonism, anarchy, destruction. Surgeons are needed; quacks have been at work long enough. Some limbs may have to be amputated; where a wrench has caused distortion a wrench may be required to restore symmetry and health. For ages the organization of labor has been discussed; the horizon has been enlarged and we demand an organization of industries, including labor, capital, intellect, all in fact that is involved in the industries. Each factor must be studied; all the

industrial factors must be put into right relations and proper proportions; from each its part, to each its part; each for all, all for each. We are not yet prepared for this organization, having neither the requisite knowledge nor the exalted altruistic disposition. But society is working for this organization, and is moving toward that industrial system of which at present we have only the elements. It is a mark of great progress that there are some at least who know what we need and who want what is needed.

Evolution in Political Economy.

Rogers * echoes the views of many: "The reproach of political economy is that it is a dry and hard system, which has no sympathies, and only proposes to suffering humanity a bundle of unwelcome truths which it affirms to be natural laws. In many cases these are neither truths nor laws, but paradoxes, which have not even the merit of experimental inductions, but at best are doubtful tendencies elevated to the rank of principles. I cannot take up any ordinary work on political economy without finding in every page a dogma which is controverted by facts, and with the great exception of Adam Smith, I know of no writer in England who has been at the pains to verify what he confidently affirms by the evidence of what has actually taken place." Political economy has been called the dismal or even the brutal science; men have turned from it because it seemed so inhuman. Even fundamental principles were unsettled, and its teachers, by their disputes respecting what was undetermined, not only neglected to develop what was settled, but also increased the already reigning confusion. The very character of political economy has repelled students. Yet the fact that so much still remained to be done in economic science was a reason

* Six Centuries, II., 435.

for most earnest study. What is finished exists only to be learned; but what is still to be unfolded affords the best opportunity for energy and ability.

A new start has, however, been taken in political economy, and this is leading it out of the old ruts. For decades eminent thinkers, particularly in the German and the Austrian schools, have broken through the traditional dogmatism of the orthodox economics and exploded various theories which had been treated as axiomatic. The general aim has been to conserve the truth developed by Adam Smith in his epoch-making work and compressed in the abstractions of Ricardo, but at the same time to criticise these authors and their successors, to start with them, but not to end with them. With their destructive criticism the new economists united constructive processes. This work has been in progress about half a century and its growth has been cumulative. The few have become a host. Eminent teachers, who are at the same time thinkers, occupy chairs of political economy in the universities of Europe and America; scholarly journals in economics have been established, and an extensive and most valuable literature has been created. The general trend has been from dogmatism to empirical investigation, from abstractions to concrete reality and history; the result, however, has not been a shallow empiricism or distracted details, but principles, laws, and systems. So far has the movement been from confinement to narrow dogmatic grooves that all systems were carefully studied. The history of theories was traced, socialism was investigated and its claims tested; as a consequence, theories and systems that were rejected served as an inspiration to new inquiries and gave new impulses to enlarged views. Errors were rooted out and truths planted in their stead. Freshness took the place of stagnation and life prevailed where death had reigned. In the good begin-

ning made we behold a prophecy of better things to come. The transformation of political economy is one of the first steps in the transformation of the industries.

A Human Science.

The dismal, brutal science of things is rapidly becoming a human and a humane science. Men have been thinking in abstractions and generalities about national prosperity and the wealth of nations. Our age has analyzed these notions and found that, so far as they have reality and actuality, they mean the prosperity or welfare of the citizens who compose the nation and the wealth of the individuals of the nation. We have lost the taste for abstract wealth and demand that genuine article which belongs to individuals, enriches and blesses them. National wealth which exists for no one and which nobody has is a myth; but the wealth which the people have constitutes the wealth of a nation. Hence the emphasis on the distribution of wealth; it is to be put into the possession of as many deserving ones as possible to make them happy; and the individuals thus made prosperous constitute national prosperity. Of course these individuals are not viewed as isolated particles, but as constituting a nation; and besides the individual possessions there may be national possessions; but these have value only so far as they exist for the people and bless them. Not money for money's sake, but money for men, that is the demand.

This humanizing process is seen in other respects likewise. Roscher, who died recently, lived to see the publication of the twenty-first edition of the first volume of his Political Economy. In his first note he pronounces it characteristic that Adam Smith begins his work with the idea of the annual national income; Say begins his book with the idea of wealth; Ricardo begins with a discussion of value. In Roscher's own book, however, this is the first

sentence of the text: "*Man* is the beginning and the end of our science." Formerly notions, abstractions, came first; but now man is first and last! He quotes Stahl: "The true, perfected political economy must have as its essence the personality (man in his totality of being, as intellectual and moral, as well as physical) and the moral kingdom, the ethical community of men, who are the necessary owners of the material goods and the recipients of material satisfaction." Others also treat political economy as thoroughly human and social and closely allied to ethics. This has become characteristic of the whole school of advanced thinkers. All emphasize the necessity of the ethical element in economic affairs, though there is some dispute as to how far political economy is itself to be considered as ethical.

Dominance of Natural Law.

The old school was prone to treat economic laws as natural, as if in business affairs men were wholly subject to nature, the slaves of fate. This became an axiom in business. The concentration of wealth and the miseries of poverty were treated as natural laws. Hence these conditions were pronounced unavoidable, efforts to change them were regarded as fighting against nature and providence, and nothing remained but resignation or despair. What folly for laborers to war against fate! So long as they believed this their enslavement was assured by their apathy. Laws to promote their health, to secure them against accident, to protect children and women from greed and brutality, were decried as a violation of nature, and were resisted by capital to the utmost in the classic land of the orthodox political economy. The natural law of demand and supply was thought to be final. Lassalle, following Ricardo, interpreted it to mean that the tendency will always be to keep wages down to the bare level of the

existence of the laborer and his family, that is, the future laborers.

This supposed "iron law" has been one of the strongest forces of revolutionary socialists. Even they, however, do not now insist on its necessity or on its universal working. Human initiative, motive, effort, are admitted to have something to say in the matter. The law may be broken by the humanity of the employer and by the combination of laborers. Thus the power of the personal factor is admitted. The lowest wages, in order to secure the highest profits, are not a natural necessity. The highest wages may be the cheapest. The most valuable production requires the best workmen, of which England and the United States furnish the proof. No industries can be permanently successful unless the condition of the laboring classes is a favorable one. The value of production may depend largely on the ability of the laboring classes to be consumers.

Self-Interest.

A most pernicious, even diabolical, application of this theory of the absolute dominance of natural law was the advocacy of self-interest as the sole motive in industrial pursuits. Self-interest was readily interpreted to mean selfishness; and if this is once reduced to a natural law it becomes inevitable. Thus a justification is found for selfish aims, for egoism, for baseness, and nature's fiat or God's decree is made responsible for human meanness. Laborers have to be exploited; it is a necessity, and necessity knows no law but that of necessity. The theory was even invented that it is to the advantage of laborers to have the profits of capital increased at their expense. This *normal* growth of capitalism was declared to mean business prosperity for the welfare of the toilers! Some *professed* to believe in this method of making laborers rich by robbing them, and the theory was con-

sistently practiced. Its reasons are on a par with those of the heathen Greeks and Romans in favor of slavery.

This naturalism or infernalism has found advocates even among preachers. A minister, whose name is given, declared at a meeting of one of the most respectable and most intelligent of religious bodies, that business laws founded on selfishness are as "inevitable and inexorable as laws of planetary motion." Of course he was hissed? No, he was cheered! When teachers and preachers advocate such doctrines, what can be expected of manufacturers and business men? If doomed to base principles in business, how can they avoid following them? There is no more effective way of making men slaves than by convincing them that slavery is their calling. The selfish theory is an inestimable degradation of business, and it is a wonder that respectable men submitted to the dire disgrace. If this selfishness is the law for the employer, why not also for laborers? It is the curse of this law from which society is now suffering.

Growth of Capital.

That capital is "stored-up" labor is a favorite theory whose application is often thoughtless. If capital is stored-up labor it ought to belong to labor. The truth is that all the factors which produce capital are stored up, are compressed or congealed in capital, such as intellect, inventions, skill, management, and manual labor. On the one hand we find that social democrats claim for manual laborers all capital because solely the product of their toil, and on the other capitalists claim a right to capital because it represents labor, sacrifice, economy, on their part. So far, however, as the existing capital is concerned, some of it belongs to its present possessors because it is stored-up knavery and robbery, and the growth of capital in their hands means an increase of these qualities. In other respects also mistaken

views are advocated respecting the growth of capital. This growth is thought to be of necessity a benefit to the laborer even if it goes to the capitalist. The fact is overlooked that it might be a much greater blessing to the laborer if he were made the possessor of the increased wealth. If it helps labor when the capitalist spends it on his person, why would not the same money help labor if the laborer spent it on himself and his family? But if the capitalist invests the increase of wealth, why would not that wealth be as great a public benefit if the laborer invests it? It is by no means indifferent, so far as laborers are concerned, how the money is spent, provided only that it be spent. Ten thousand a year spent on dogs and horses might, if given to laborers, elevate the standard of life of a hundred or more. It is not the same whether a fortune be spent on yachts and club-houses, or on the dwellings of laborers. The money may be so spent as to rob the poor of employment. Half a million used to turn arable land into a hunting park may promote the culture of brutes while scores of laborers are permanently thrown out of their accustomed employment. Laborers and society at large are deeply interested in the manner in which money is spent.

The Personal Law.

The fiendish economic theory that in the industries men are wholly under the control of natural law has had its day. Dr. Adolph Wagner has elaborate psychological discussions in his political economy; Dr. Schmoller's economic works contain numerous paragraphs which read like a treatise on ethics; many other authors emphasize the moral factor in production and distribution; a System of "Christian Economics" has actually been advocated in England; and in different countries advanced thinkers spurn the notion that a man is the slave of things and in his business wholly subject to the tyranny of natural law.

Many hold with Dr. Wagner that political economy is an art as well as a science, that it has fixed laws, but also abundant room for rational plans and for the attainment of moral ends. It is the whole man who enters business, and it is infamous to regard the selfish and base elements of a man as the essentials which constitute him a manufacturer, merchant, or laborer. No less in economic affairs than in society or the church is he intellectual, moral, and spiritual. He naturally adopts the principles of utility and seeks the utmost results from the least effort; but he can do this justly, never letting the end justify the means. With the best economic means he may connect the most exalted aim; and business can be as unselfish as preaching or missionary work. Jesuits are sometimes very shrewd business men and yet do all for the sake of their church. A missionary friend in Africa cultivates a coffee plantation, but for the sake of the mission. The fact is that the motive which controls a man's life also controls him in his business pursuits and relations. While thus admitting the force of the natural laws actually at work in economics, we at the same time recognize the force of the personal laws. It is the dominance of a false materialism which seeks to suppress the personality as a factor in personal affairs. Men are moved, but they are likewise the movers; they are subject to political economy, but they may also subject political economy to their purposes; they may be dominated by business or may make business the means to accomplish moral and spiritual ends.

Results.

Preserve and develop the tree, but destroy the worms that eat its leaves and fruit: that is the meaning of the evolution we advocate. Lop off branches, dig about the roots, be unsparing in destruction, but all for the sake of sparing, unfolding, and purifying the precious existing life. For this end nothing can be too

radical; but this end must be the constant aim. With great hope we look upon the evolution now in vigorous progress. One need but launch out into the deep to discover that many precious new thoughts have already been evolved, especially such as have social significance. Great is the gain in that what is social has not only been made prominent but in many instances a dominant factor in the age, both in thought and movement. The attention devoted to socialism is an evidence of this. The age is intent on discovering what belongs to society and how to give it to society. Whoever sees both the superficial movements and the underlying causes, will find that the social era has dawned, and that it need but be properly developed in order to meet those urgent demands now made by the agitated classes. Men on the alert, with their finger on the pulse of the age, men of thought, of aspiration, of action, realize that the crisis is at hand, that an epoch is at the door, and that all the good forces of society are needed to make it of supreme blessing to humanity. Not only do new thoughts mark our era, but a new spirit is here, an awakening to conditions formerly ignored, to demands formerly unheeded, to responsibilities formerly unappreciated. The various classes of society are studied, their relations and duties are investigated, great sympathy is manifested for the laborers, and their neglect is regarded as a disgrace to humanity. New movements of great importance have sprung up, and the evolution of organizations is in rapid progress. A new world has been discovered—of social relations, responsibilities, and forces—and some have already entered its confines. It is recognized that external relations ought to be changed, but that there must likewise be a total regeneration of society itself, creating new motives, and lifting thought and purpose and life on a higher plane. We cannot question that the epoch-making ideas

will inaugurate the epoch of which they are the seed and the prophecy.

Literature.

The relation of Christianity and the church to the Social Problem is naturally discussed chiefly by theologians and preachers. Laveleye, however, has two excellent chapters on Evangelical and Catholic Socialists. Quite an extensive literature has appeared in Germany, England and America by adherents of what is designated Christian Socialism. Among the earlier works are those of Kingsley and Maurice. "The Dawn," Boston, represents the views of Christian socialists. Many who do not call themselves socialists advocate a more active interest in social matters on the part of the church. Westcott, "Social Aspects of Christianity," and "The Incarnation of Common Life," Macmillan. Kaufmann, "Christian Socialism," Kegan Paul. P. W. Sprague, same title, Dutton & Co., New York. R. Heber Newton, "Social Studies," Putnam's Sons. Bascom, "Sociology," the same. E. B. Andrews, "Wealth and Moral Law," Hartford Seminary Press. Washington Gladden, "Tools and the Man," Houghton, Mifflin & Co. "Applied Christianity; Moral Aspects of Social Questions," by the same. Ely, "Social Aspects of Christianity," Crowell & Co. Josiah Strong, "The New Era, or, the Coming Kingdom." Lyman Abbott, "The Church and Social Problems," Houghton & Co. W. H. Freemantle, "Bampton Lectures." J. S. Commons, "Social Reform and the Church," Crowell & Co. *The Economic Review*, London, discusses economic problems from the Christian point of view.

For half a century leading German writers on political economy have aimed to bring the subject into more intimate relation with ethics and all the social disciplines. This is evident from the numerous articles in the sixty or seventy volumes of Hildebrand's "*Jahrbuecher.*" To

name the advocates of this movement would require the mention of all the first class economic thinkers of Germany, Roscher, Schæffle, Wagner, Schmoller, Brentano, Schœnberg, Conrad, etc., and for proof reference need only be made to their works. The most complete and most valuable repository of the views of these economists and of economic theories in general is found in G. Schœnberg's "*Handbuch der Politischen Oekonomie*," Laupp, Tuebingen, three large volumes. The clearest enunciation of the relation of ethics to economics is probably given by Schmoller, "*Ueber einige Grundfragen des Rechts und der Volkswirthschaft.*" The history of this movement is given by Roscher, "*Geschichte der National-Oekonomie in Deutschland*," Munich. A brief sketch of this history is given in Cohn's "History of Political Economy," American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, and in Costa's "Itroduction to the Study of Political Economy," Macmillan. See also Laveleye, Chapter XII., on socialists of the chair. This trend is not, however, confined to Germany, but affects economic science in all lands. It is very marked among English writers, even when, like Keynes' "Scope and Method of Political Economy," they insist on keeping economics and ethics wholly distinct. The question is not so much what ethical elements shall be introduced into political economy, as this: How shall political economy be related to ethics? Few will be found to question the words of Marshall, preface: "Ethical forces are among those of which the economist has to take account. Attempts have indeed been made to construct an abstract science with regard to the actions of an 'economic man,' who is under no ethical influences and who pursues pecuniary gain warily and energetically, but mechanically and selfishly. But they have not been successful, nor even thoroughly carried out." For a keen criticism of the trend in the German school of

economists see Menger, "*Untersuchungen ueber die Methode der Socialwissenschaften und der Politischen Oekonomie insbesondere*," Duncker und Humblot, Leipzig. Menger contends too much for political economy as an abstract science, and wants it to be exact as chemistry and physics, which it cannot be. His treatment of self-interest is clearly a failure. We are mainly interested in economics as related to psychology, the state, ethics, and sociology, and Menger's contention does not affect our standpoint.

The works on political economy in English are very numerous. Of the older writers—Adam Smith, Malthus (on Population), Ricardo, and Mill—the first and last are most valuable. The more recent works of Marshall (incomplete, only one volume), Hearn (Plutology), Walker, Ely, Hadley, and of many others are well known and easily accessible to students.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FUNCTION OF THE STATE IN THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

The State.

With the attacks on principles and the undermining of systems, so common in our day, it is not surprising that the very nature of the state is in dispute. Is it based on a mere contract, as Rousseau taught and the anarchists claim? Then the state is nothing but a voluntary association whose authority depends on the will of the contracting parties. Those who form the state can, according to this theory, likewise dissolve it. Is the state a creation of the people? Certainly not an arbitrary creation out of nothing. A particular state is a growth, partly according to an adopted plan, but largely unconscious. The state itself no doubt arose in different ways, at different times, and in various places. It seems to be a development of the tribe or the product of a union of tribes. In a certain sense it is a natural product, like the family, an evolution according to the inherent nature of things. The conditions of the state are found in the very being of society, and it was only necessary for a certain degree of social progress to be attained in order to make the state a necessity. Without it society on a large scale and in a perfected stage could not exist. The idea of the state is therefore inherent in society; its principles exist in social being; and the state as a social growth involves eternal principles which may be discovered but are not invented. By thus postulating certain elements in the state as a necessary evolution we do not deny the power of

voluntary action in the formation and development of states. A man can mould the gold and develop the seed which he cannot create. The state rests on principles which men have no right to change at will. Being removed from the whims of individuals and parties, these principles are simply to be recognized and applied. The state involves personal and social relations which exist whether we recognize them or not. In the existence of the state there are principles, laws, duties, and responsibilities, which are above the people; they constitute a higher law than individual preferences. Such being the character of the state, it is natural that its authority should be peculiar, with an absoluteness and finality which belong to no mere voluntary association. The existing state can be attacked, the kind of state and the form of government may be in dispute, and revolutions may occur; but the state itself is a necessity for the well-being of society. It has essential and invariable elements, and progress can be made in their discovery and application; but it also has variable elements, and progress in their evolution is possible.

The prevalent theories of the state find their explanation in the history of the state. According to the ancient theory the individual exists for the state; but in modern times the theory prevails that the state exists for the individual and for society. The despotic monarch in the Middle Ages and since made himself the sovereign for whose sake the state existed, perhaps even identified himself with the state. Against this subjection of the many to one the strongest re-action occurred toward the close of last century, which meant the end of despotic monarchism. An individualism arose which opposed the despotism of the state and regarded the state itself as a necessary evil whose authority is to be minimized as much as possible. Its functions were made chiefly negative, to prevent interfer-

ence with individual freedom, instead of positive, directly promoting the welfare of the people by positive enactments, particularly with respect to the industries. But the notion of the state as a despotism above the people disappears so soon as the state is regarded as an expression of the people, is of them, through them, and for them. In that case it is their best friend, their organ for the accomplishment of their aims. In its proper sphere, accordingly, it never can have too much authority.

Development of the Theory of the State.

We must regard the founding of the American republic and the political achievements of the French revolution as the culmination of the thoughts and movements of many ages; but it was a culmination which at the same time became the condition for a new start in the process of evolution. For more than a century the history of the United States has been engaged in the evolution and solutions of problems. In American history the solution of problems, as is usually the case, has meant the evolution of new and greater ones. The war for the Union solved the problem of the relation of capital to slave labor; but the deeper and broader problem of the relation of capital to labor itself remains. The black slave has been freed; but has slavery vanished? A new problem has been thrust on the nations, the problem of the relation of the state to individualism and competition. The new era is marked by the growing dominance of social affairs in the state and in national life. This sphere, comparatively new, enlarges the function of the state, and opens up possibilities and opportunities heretofore but little considered. A remarkable revival in the study of the state is now in progress. Students in political economy find that they must include the theory of the state in their inquiries in order to do the most efficient work in the Social Prob-

lem. *Political* economy or, as the Germans and other Europeans term it, *national* economy, is most intimately connected with the affairs of state; in all enlightened lands these affairs are largely or chiefly economic. This study of political science has been promoted by the revolutionary movements which aim at the destruction of the existing state. The labor organizations of Europe and America, either political already or rapidly becoming political, thrust new problems on statesmen. The state is the ultimate appeal in the existing antagonisms and conflicts, and each party is anxious to secure the authoritative and final decision in its favor. As the state comprehends all the organizations within the nation, it must so determine their relations that peace and order may be established and progress promoted. This demand is individual and social, a requirement of personal and collective welfare. War in society means the destruction of society or some of its members. But it is also a national demand; national welfare is conditioned by individual and social prosperity; besides, the social conflict of classes endangers the very life of the nation, and at present certain movements aim at the destruction of the state itself. Self-preservation is the first law of being; and in order that the state may be perpetuated it must determine what its attitude shall be toward social relations and conflicts. In other words, the theory of the state must be developed, and it is probable that there never was a time when specialists in this line of study increased more rapidly or devoted themselves more earnestly to the national problems involved in social questions. The social specialist can hardly doubt that of all the factors in society the state is the most important in the solution of the Social Problem.

The State and Society.

There are specialists in political science who regard the state as a particular form of society, while others distinguish between the state and society. The question is not material, provided that we emphasize the peculiarity of the state in contrast with merely voluntary associations. The state as different from other forms of society has functions of supreme importance. These functions refer mainly to overt acts, not to mere opinions or personal convictions. But even respecting the latter the state has an important work, namely, in education. If the state undertakes to educate the children, it necessarily influences the personal views and character, which are the source of outward action. Then, the laws, the politics, all state institutions and actions, have an educational influence. We are prone to regard the state only as a law-making and executing power, and therefore overlook its other functions. All along we have emphasized the intellectual and moral character of men as the most essential elements in their social relations. This of course does not imply indifference with respect to their external environment. Frequent attention has been called to its importance. In view of the one-sided emphasis which this environment receives in our day, we must lay especial stress upon the character of men, without depreciating the effect of the surroundings on the mind and the heart. The larger part of the action of the state refers to institutions, and to the external conditions, and the attitude of men toward them. These are the things mainly to be considered when we speak of state action. If for some decades the surroundings of men have received special attention, it was due largely to the former neglect of the environment by an extreme idealism.

One need but enter the slums of any large city to be impressed with the difficulty or even impossibility of inner

purity amid such conditions. Dirt and crime are twins. Pestilence is the very atmosphere of the slums. The dwellings are wretched; filth accumulates; the air is foul; the courts are small and vile; the alleys breed epidemics; rags, unwashed faces, and unkempt hair, go together with emaciated, sallow cheeks, and dead eyes; saloons abound; the pawn shop is near; cheap goods, and bad as cheap, fill the shop windows; the most corrupting pictures and novels are displayed; and police stations are suggestively convenient. Everywhere red noses, bruised faces, and vicious looks. The women are a painful spectacle, the very opposite of what all our theories about woman declare that she ought to be. The children are, however, the saddest sight. They look prematurely old and suggest that a progressive degeneration is going on. It is conditions like these which are beyond the control of individual action; they must be dealt with by society, by the municipality, or the state. There is, as has been shown, no need of slums; that is proved by cities like Berlin, where poverty abounds, but where the city authorities and police regulations prevent the existence of conditions which disgrace most of our large cities. It is this environment, these condition, with which the authorities must deal. Certain institutions which are a curse ought to be removed, and others which are a blessing put in their place. It must be a strange community which cannot protect itself against institutional evils of a general character and put good institutions in their place. Society has a right to demand of the state such general beneficial arrangements as are its peculiar function, and which cannot be the function of any particular class of society. At the same time society is to blame if it does not insist on the greater efficiency of the state, for, after all, state action in a republic is only social action in an authoritative form.

Fourfold Function of the State.

The state has four distinct functions. It protects the rights of the individual and seeks to secure their freest and fullest exercise; it aims to put individuals in proper relations to one another so as to form an orderly society, and then strives to promote the highest welfare of society; it has national interests to establish and conserve, affairs which concern all classes, the protection of the nation, the development of its resources; and it must determine its own relation to other nations, and thus fix its place and maintain its rights as an integral part of humanity and the world. We express these fourfold functions of the state by saying that it has an individual, a social, a national, and an international significance; it legislates and acts with reference to the individual personality, to society, to the nation, and to the world. It educates the individual, protects his person and property, and gives him opportunity for development and action; it makes laws for the relations of men, and executes these laws in the interest of society; if the state exists for one and for all, it ought to be strong and perfect for the sake of each and all, and therefore the nation must protect itself and seek the most perfect national development; these internal and national concerns can be properly attended to only by putting the nation itself in a right attitude toward other nations. Yet the international relations are not of a selfish character; a people ought to be concerned about the world of which they are a part; and these relations involve many humane and altruistic considerations.

The Personality in these Functions.

In all these functions the personality comes to the front. The law is made and executed by persons and it deals directly with persons. Property plays a prominent part in state affairs, but it ought always to be as related to persons. Things are no concern of the state, except so far as they have some personal significance. It is a serious mistake to give things a political importance, except so far as they have some human interest. But it is also a mistake to regard persons abstracted from things as the object of state concern. Every state takes into account the person in his environment and with his possessions. We thus see how personalities constitute the essence of a nation, while at the same time property and things are such important considerations in national affairs.

Politics.

In its constitution a nation embodies its principles; its laws are an application of these principles to special cases. These are the ideal elements in national life; the reality is found in the actual character and conduct of the people. There is always a marked contrast between the real and the ideal. National progress consists in the development of the ideal itself and in the approach of the reality to the ideal. The realm of politics is limited by the ideal elements, the constitution and the laws. Both the constitution and the laws can be changed; but while they exist they mark the sphere of political action. The ordinary sphere of politics is one of expediency. The principles being given in the constitution, the question is how they ought to be applied. Political wisdom consists in such a use of the functions of the state as will best accomplish the ends for which the state exists. A statesman embodies the principles of the nation and the political wisdom required for their most expedient applica-

tion. He must discern what belongs to the individual, to society, to the nation, to the world, and secure to each its due from the state. As we are considering the Social Problem, it is our purpose to determine the social function of the state in the solution of that problem, the sphere now requiring special attention from politics.

Responsibility of States and Communities.

One of our most serious difficulties consists in the fact that the responsibility of states and communities is not sufficiently recognized. We dismiss the whole matter with the dictum: Corporations have no souls; and we treat states and municipalities also as soulless abstractions. Corporations, municipalities, states, nations, are composed of individuals, and these are responsible; for as they are, so are the organizations which they form. The state as the collectivity of individuals is responsible for its laws and their execution. When laws are made to be violated rather than obeyed, is it any wonder that respect for authority is destroyed, that mobs, violence, lynching, and anarchy prevail? The state has a right to demand unconditional obedience to its enactments; if this is not demanded, then the laws ought to be repealed. But to this there is another side. The state or municipality is no less than the individual citizen responsible for the trust committed. The appointing power is accountable for the parties appointed. This responsibility must be emphasized. If the responsibility of a president becomes too great when held accountable for his appointments, then the power to make such appointments ought to be conferred on some one else. The mayor who appoints a policeman that is habitually negligent is responsible for his appointee. If I pay to have my house protected, have I not a right to demand its protection just as much as I demand a supply of water and gas if I contract and pay for them? The com-

munity which licenses gambling houses, saloons, and other dens of iniquity, is responsible for the results. If boys become drunkards in the licensed saloons, and if men and families are ruined through the intemperance there produced, ought not the responsible community to suffer for the same? If redress were demanded in every such instance and a heavy fine imposed, the pockets of the citizens would be so squeezed that the voters would rebel, and they would hesitate to assume responsibilities for which they are held pecuniarily responsible. States and cities which give valuable monopolies and inestimable privileges to corporations, without claiming any supervision or control over the supreme interests of the people, deserve the punishment usually inflicted upon them. When an outraged people criminally submit to such outrages, ought they not to suffer? The time may come when authority shall mean responsibility as well as power; but its coming has hardly yet been heralded.

Liberty.

Among the chief functions of the state is the securing of liberty to the citizens. So far as personal liberty is concerned we must regard it as mainly a personal achievement. The government may promote it by education and give it favorable conditions; but in all its essential elements it must be wrought out by the individual for himself. The main function of the government consists in securing and protecting social liberty, that is, the establishment of such conditions as will enable men to exercise freely their personal freedom in their relations to their fellow-men. If a man has not the means of existence, he has not the means of freedom; if he is enslaved by his very efforts to secure a livelihood, then he lacks the conditions of freedom. Can the state permit such conditions as involve the enslavement of one class by another? Wealth enables a man to gain the ascendancy over others

in various ways, so as to make them subject to himself. So far as labor is concerned we see this subjection in slavery, in serfdom, and also in what is called free labor. If a certain class depend on another for their livelihood, are they not then in danger of a subjection which is really a species of enslavement? Here is one of the greatest of our modern dangers and difficulties; there is nominal and legal freedom, but real economic and social freedom is in many respects a myth. How can that personal freedom, which is already achieved, obtain, under the authority of the state, such conditions as will enlarge it to social freedom?

Equality.

For over a century the cry has been for liberty; and if the demand for equality was coupled with it, the two were often treated as separable. We have rejected the notion of perfect equality as a myth. Neither by nature nor in achievement are men equal, and therefore perfect social equality is impossible. But there is a difference between social inequalities which depend on external conditions or institutions, and those which depend on purely personal characteristics. Of two men, the one of greater intellect and worth may now be socially inferior to another who is beneath him in mind and character; the difference is due to external conditions. A title or wealth often covers a multitude of sins and stupidities. Such progress has been made that now we know that social liberty and social equality are so intimately connected that they cannot be separated. Men who are not socially equal are not equally free socially. If a nobleman has a freedom which the people have not, it is due to the fact that the people are not equal to the nobleman. Despotic monarchy has been abolished in order to give the sovereignty to the people; that is, inequality has been destroyed in the interest of liberty. But the political equality achieved has not established social equality, and from this

fact political equality and liberty suffer. The important problem of the function of the state with respect to social equality is now presented for solution.

Equality of Opportunity.

Whatever barriers may be in the way of the establishment of social equality and liberty, one thing is certain: it ought to be the aim of the state to secure for all its citizens every possible equality of opportunity. So rational is this aim that hardly any will be found to question its desirability. It does not appear why all citizens should not be thrown on their own resources, with the political and social institutions and arrangements of such a character as to give each an equal chance to make the most of himself. There must be something radically wrong in a state where, from the very start and throughout the whole course of life, some have every advantage in their favor, while the rest are deprived of the same. So far as these distinctions are social arrangements they can be changed by society through the authority of the state. By giving all possible equality of opportunity to all, it will depend on personal effort what shall be made of the opportunities. Thus the responsibility is thrown wholly on the individual, and he will have himself to thank or blame for the use or neglect of his advantages. Only in this way can the personal power of individuals in a state attain the highest development. If this development is not attained, the state is itself the loser. It ought to have the most intelligent, the wisest, and the best citizens, and it cannot afford to neglect the brain and brawn and skill and energy of its people. There will always be inequalities enough left in point of opportunity; thus the children of the virtuous in a home of love and purity will have inestimable advantages over the children in homes of vice. So far, however, as the

function of the state extends, the mission to establish all possible equality of opportunity is unquestionable.

Wrong View of Evolution.

There is a view of individual and social evolution which is as pernicious as false. It puts the struggle for existence at the basis of progress, and reduces that progress to the survival of the fittest. The struggle for existence and the resulting contest of a man with his fellowmen are, however, only a part of the forces which promote human development. All the powers of man enter into the process; and whatever calls these powers into exercise is a factor in the progress. Thus all the passions, love, hate, revenge, ambition, as also the religious instincts and the human sympathies, are concerned. All that man is in his environment, and all that he is made by contact with his surroundings, will have to be taken into account in his individual and social progress. If the process of development is such that the fittest survive, then the inference seems natural that it is right that the strong live and flourish, while the weak are destroyed; and that result is deemed the best development of humanity itself. The weak may rebel and resist destruction, but the inexorable law of human progress demands their annihilation. If this is the correct view, then the state ought to promote this process rather than to interfere in behalf of the weak. Call this theory naturalistic or what you will, its essence is brutality. Human institutions may be such as to help an undeserving class to survive, while the more deserving are crushed. If the Turk oppresses and crushes the Armenian, is it because the latter is an inferior being? We are too apt to put brute force as the dominant factor of human progress, and to forget the higher considerations. There is no reason for giving the predominance to brutal strength over reason and morals and ideals. The strong might be stronger and bet-

ter if they rationally and humanely considered the weak, instead of crushing them. Most of all ought every institution to be destroyed which weakens the strong and which prevents the weak from developing strength. If human selection is to be just, it must make conditions which give the inherent strength in men equal chances for exercise. By adding rational and moral selection to what is called natural selection, the human race might be improved more than by a law which puts the lamb at the disposal of the wolf, and a human being at the mercy of hyenas. We need not ask the strong to give up their strength; all we ask is that they use it aright and give others what belongs to them, and that they consider the higher as well as the lower human instincts. Are Tilly and Alba superior because they have the power to destroy their victims, and was the destruction of their victims necessary for human progress?

Education.

The state as a great civilizing power is the ideal of advanced thinkers in political science. Its police function is subordinate to the active promotion of culture and the development of the highest interests of humanity. As thus the idea of the state grows in richness its educational functions receive greater prominence. Bluntschli, one of the foremost writers on the science of the state, says: "The life-task of every individual is to develop his capacities and to manifest his essence." In these words he indicates the sphere which is regarded by himself and many others as the domain for much of the state's most important activity. For our problem this sphere has peculiar significance. Few are prepared to believe how strong a desire to develop their innate powers has seized certain circles of the laboring classes. Our institutions ought to be pronounced a failure did they not impel the laborer to seek the advantages of culture. Even in Italy we find an association of laborers assert that "the end

to be attained is to assure to men the most complete happiness possible, by the full development of all their faculties." In Saxony there are young operatives who devote their spare time to the study of solid works of a technical and scientific character. Not only are the attractions of culture felt by many laborers, but education is also recognized as the prime condition for attaining a better industrial and social position. Whoever fails to make the most of himself misses life's aim, and the responsibility for this failure ought not to rest on the state. A nation has no room for criminals, and it ought to have none for the ignorant. The safety and welfare of the state require intelligent citizens, and the law of self-preservation demands that the children be educated. About this there can be no question, though the degree of education by the state may be disputed. Equal chances for all here of course means that to each is to be given according to capacity and needs. So indispensable is education that it ought to be compulsory from the age of six to fourteen. Even later, say till eighteen, provision ought to be made for instruction during several hours every week, perhaps in evening schools. If private or parochial schools are to take the place of the public schools, it ought to be solely with the sanction and under the supervision of the state or municipality. Unless the state is assured that they furnish the requisite instruction, they cannot be regarded as a substitute for its own schools. If poverty interferes with the attendance of children at school, the state is bound to overcome the difficulty; it may be necessary to furnish the children with meals, with clothing, with books, and even with shelter. The state must abdicate its functions before it can heed greedy parents who insist on obliging their children to work, for the sake of appropriating the earnings, or ignorant and vicious ones who prefer to keep their children ignorant. The state

which does not protect itself and the welfare of children by putting its higher wisdom and superior power in place of the imbecility and wickedness of such parents, does not deserve to exist.

While an average education is a national requirement for all, the way to higher education ought to be opened to the brightest and most aspiring children. This might be done by competitive examinations, in which all are put on an equal footing, while only the most promising are advanced. In the Royal High School of Music in Berlin this plan is adopted, and thus the highest advantages are secured to such as are thought likely to profit most by them. It need not be shown that such an arrangement is a benefit to society as well as to the individual. Private munificence in some instances opens avenues for the poorer classes. No other country equals the United States in this respect. But if men glorify themselves through magnificent charities by giving for education what is the product of fraud or of robbing laborers and stealing from communities and states, then such gifts ought to be spurned, and, if possible, the funds restored to those from whom they were stolen. The benefit of endowments to institutions of learning ought to be chiefly for the poorer students. If a university gives for one hundred dollars in tuition what actually costs a thousand, why should a millionaire accept the charity for his son? Why does he not insist on paying the cost of what he gets, in order that the entire charity may go to those who cannot pay the thousand dollars? If those who can afford it pay the actual cost, many others might receive such advantages as are now beyond their reach. What sense is there in endowments for such as do not need the endowments? But whatever may be done in the way of endowments, stipends, scholarships, and fellowships, by private generosity, the state has a special duty in

supplying any want or neglect which interferes with educational facilities to such as ought to have them. In the instruction furnished and demanded by the state some branches, besides a general education, ought to be taught, especially the elements of political economy and the fundamental principles of the state and of government. So long as ignorance respecting citizenship prevails we cannot expect the duties of citizens to be performed. For the sake of the national industries technical schools, equally accessible to all, are needed. This is also true of manual training schools. Libraries selected with special reference to education rather than entertainment, and the best appliances and apparatus for schools, should also be provided.

The fundamental work of our elementary schools requires the best ability; but this can be expected only when the salary is correspondingly good. The opportunities of girls ought to be equal to those of boys. If there must be discrimination, let it be in favor of the girls. In the struggle of life as bread-earners the discrimination is strongly against them, and it would be but just to promote a degree of equality by educational advantages. But there is still a stronger reason. The family depends chiefly on woman. The father is usually occupied with the distractions of business and can do little for the training of his children. The duties thus devolving on the mother require special education in order that she may educate the children aright. As the culture in the home chiefly devolves on her, she lays the foundation for the welfare of the future generation. The husband himself is personally benefitted by her enlightenment. His engagements may not permit him to keep pace with the intellectual currents of the day; the wife likely has more leisure for this, and it is not strange that in many cases she is her husband's superior in this respect. Her position in regard to the intellect, the

culture, and the refinement of the home and of society requires that the best possible educational opportunites be afforded to woman.

In many places the American flag floats over American schools. This ought to be evidence that the public school is under the protection of that flag and shall no more be touched by profane hands than the flag itself. American institutions must be defended at any cost, and none is more sacred than our national schools. If this defence means conflict, then the sooner it comes the better. Immigrants who want the benefits of the United States, but at the same time seek to transplant foreign institutions on American soil and to rob America of those peculiarities which are the glory of the nation's history and character, ought to be made harmless; let them be sent back whence they came, if they come to destroy American freedom and if their destructive work cannot otherwise be stopped. No plea for labor, no sympathy for laborers, no sentimental love for humanity, must be permitted to exalt hoodlums, to tolerate ruinous bigotry, and to trample under foot what has made the United States the refuge and the hope of the oppressed. Here this decision is especially needed; other nations have the means and the courage to protect themselves.

Education and Politics.

Men controlled by national considerations and a love of truth need not be told that education should be freed from the trammels of partisan politics. School boards, superintendents, and teachers ought to be chosen on account of special fitness for their work, and with this fitness their relation to national issues may have nothing to do. Now the control of schools is often decided by the base standard of political squabbles and party interests; and where specialists are pre-eminently needed, men may be elected to

office who sadly lack moral and intellectual fitness for the place. There are likewise subjects for scholarly inquiry which ought to be promoted by the state, but not for partisan purposes. Among these are the objects furthered by the Smithsonian Institute. Special impartial commissions are also needed at times to inquire into the best methods of education, to study various phases of industries and the world's market, to pursue scientific studies, to investigate intricate problems connected with monometallism and bimetallism, with the tariff, with trusts and monopolies, with labor and capital, and similar subjects. A popular government may find it difficult to promote intellectual specialization, but it may be as important as difficult; and if it accrues to the benefit of all there is no doubt that in the course of time it will be appreciated by the people.

The State and Industries.

Few questions of fundamental importance have a deeper significance for our times than the relation of the state to the industries. The "let-alone" theory of government has long had the field, and with many men its traditional force is final as an argument for its continued supremacy. We must have competition; men for their own good must be thrown on their own resources; there must be necessity for work; otherwise progress would cease and men rot in indolence. It is not the function of the state to do for men what they ought to do for themselves; its business is to promote the development of their intellectual and physical energies to the utmost. But this requires the removal of all impediments in the way of free development. The state, in order to leave the industries to individual skill and enterprise, must give room for skill and enterprise; it must not interfere with business, but it must remove all that interferes with the individual in the exercise of his legitimate powers. Here is a large sphere for government, and

to accomplish its purpose its maximum power may have to be exerted. The least-government theory having broken down completely in its classic lands, the tendency to substitute for it that government which will promote true individualism for all and equal competition for all and genuine liberty for all, is becoming dominant. Impartial social students cannot cherish enthusiasm for a liberty which means license or for a government which means no-government, in order that the utmost opportunity may be given to unscrupulous strength and that industrial anarchy may reign where no law exists.

We see reasons for the *laisser faire* theory a century ago which no longer exist. Then it was a natural reaction against false methods of the past. When the state meant a dominant class, when the king was an autocrat, when all places of power were held by the few who subjected the people and threw all possible burdens on them, when parliaments, if they existed, were exclusively in the hands of wealth and nobility, all the law-making and law-executing authorities were used to maintain the supremacy of the aristocracy and to make the masses subservient to them. Law, and custom as inexorable as law, determined the ranks of the various classes and the place of each in his rank; laborers were hampered in their movements if not actually tied to the soil; their wage was repeatedly fixed by law and a demand for more severely punished; not only were they obliged to pay taxes which should have come from the privileged classes, but heavy duties were placed on the necessaries of life; trade was restricted, and the industries were robbed of the freedom necessary to their success. The laborer, impoverished, degraded, enslaved, by the state, naturally opposed the legislation which cursed him. Other classes being likewise oppressed, there was general opposition to the unjust and often cruel interference

of the state with business. It was against this unjustifiable spirit and method that individualism was a re-action. One extreme begat another: the state, which had legislated so unwisely and unjustly in industrial matters, was henceforth to be deprived of all authority in the same. But now conditions have changed and the state itself has been transformed. The people themselves rule, and the state is their agent, not their oppressor. The let-alone theory applied to the modern constitutional state means that the people have no right to protect themselves in their industrial pursuits by means of state action. But neither England, nor the United States, nor any advanced nation in which the people rule lets silly fears of paternalism or false theories of individualism any longer interfere with the protection of individual rights and the promotion of social welfare. No enlightened government hesitates to enact laws to protect capital and labor, to prevent industrial antagonism, and to settle conflicts between the employers and the employed. Let it but be known what laws are required for industrial, agricultural, and commercial peace and prosperity, and their enactment is assured. If it is the function of the state to secure liberty, equality, efficiency, peace, and order, within the sphere of individual action, then the state must have the power to make and execute the necessary laws. The question is not one of state interference, but of state protection and help for the promotion of individual and social rights. *Laisser faire*, whatever traditionalistic dogmatists may say, has been abandoned in practice; its own history is its absolute condemnation.*

---

* Those who desire to learn what interests which were formerly individualistic have been socialized in England, where *laisser faire* once reigned supreme, should read the "Fabian Essay" of Sidney Webb on The Historic Basis of Socialism.

Social Politics.

Intimately connected with this subject is what is called in continental Europe and in England "social politics." The meaning is that political action ought to be based on the actual social condition and should aim to meet the needs of that condition. This involves a careful investigation of the different classes, their relations and needs. We thus find social politics distinguished from abstract and purely theoretical politics, being based on national realism instead of speculation. As it takes society and all its factors into account, it also differs essentially from politics in the interest of an individual, a trust, monopoly, corporation, syndicate, party, or class. Whatever claims parties may make, it is notorious that the nations are grievously afflicted by class and partisan legislation, where social politics is the imperative need. In social politics the claims of society as a totality, including the various social factors, are recognized as supreme, and in it the remedy is found for the evils of class legislation in the past and present, and for the selfishness and cruelty of an extreme individualism.

A Limited State Socialism.

No abstract theory can determine just how far a state ought in every instance to undertake the regulation of the industries. So many circumstances are involved that particular cases have to be decided according to their peculiar merits, not according to a general rule. What the Continent requires may be inexpedient for England, and the social condition of the United States makes demands on social politics which do not exist in Europe. It is not an abstract question of the least or most government, but of the best government under given circumstances. It is common to speak of individualism and socialism as if there were no alternative but to choose the one and reject the other; there are, however, degrees of individualism as well

as of socialism. Where there are individuals an absolute socialism is impossible; and where society exists an absolute individualism is impossible. Much is gained by the recognition of the fact that between individualism and socialism the question is always one of degrees, namely, how much socialism shall there be in individualism, and how much individualism in socialism? The true system is that medium which conserves whatever advantages either offers, and rejects their false extremes. Call it *socialized individualism* or *individualized socialism*, the aim always is to express the conviction that both the individual and the social claims ought to be equally respected.

The medium between the destructive extremes is aimed at by what is known in Germany as State Socialism. It rejects the extremes of the social democracy with its omnipotent industrial state, but at the same time claims for the state an authority which gives it such a power of socialization as will overcome the evils of destructive competition. The state, it is held, must prevent those dangers which now menace society through the industrial conflicts; it ought to protect the weak against the rapacity of the strong; it ought to provide, by insurance and otherwise, for laborers in case of accident, sickness, and old age; and the state ought to assume the management of such interests as pertain to the public welfare and are subject to abuse when under the control of individuals. The advocates of this movement are found chiefly among professors of political economy and among social specialists. They form a tendency rather than an organized school, and are inquirers rather than dogmatists. They do not agree entirely among themselves, but this fact stimulates to further investigation. The expression "state socialism" is so vaguely used and liable to misunderstanding that it requires definition to make it stand for a specific movement. In order to dis-

criminate between the socialization of such interests as the welfare of society demands and the extremes of the social democracy, we can call the former a limited state socialism. Sometimes it is called socialism of the chair, on account of the prominence in it of professors. The limit to this socialization is to be determined by the freedom of the individual and the welfare of society.

Evolution of the State.

Whatever this process of socialization for individual and social well-being may be called, and whatever its ultimate results may be, there can be no question of the demand for the further evolution of the state. Being established for the sake of liberty and justice, law and order, peace and prosperity, the state which fails to promote these abdicates its functions and lacks the reasons for its existence. The principles involved in its very idea need but be developed in order to make the state an active and potent factor in so regulating the industries as to secure peace between the conflicting parties and justice to all. The state must have revenues; but these depend on the industrial prosperity and general welfare of the people. Therefore a state which neglects its industries is like the farmer who neglects the farm on which his livelihood depends. It is simply fatuity to claim that the government's business relations end with its budget, and that the sources whence its income must be drawn are not included in its concerns. All states are so intent on legislating respecting finance, agriculture, mining, manufacturing, trade, and commerce, that what has been begun need but be developed consistently in order to adopt any legislation which the industrial exigencies may require. No revolution or change of principles is involved in such legal enactments as will promote the harmony of industrial affairs so far as demanded by the interests of the public. The state, as we have seen, cannot exist

without certain socialistic or even communistic elements. It rises above the individual and the party because it aims to conserve and promote what is for the common welfare. The government is for all, so are the laws, the currency, education, postal affairs, the army and navy, the diplomatic and consular service, the census, and numerous other objects and interests. The state owns and controls vast wealth for the benefit of all and is the greatest of employers. The only question is how far this unavoidable socialism shall be extended.

The Principle.

It is easy to establish the general principle for state action with respect to the industries. It can be stated as follows: Leave to the individual whatever belongs to him, and give to the state and municipality whatever belongs to them. There are personal and private affairs which ought to be left to individual freedom and enterprise. Non-interference is the law in such matters. The aim should always be to establish the utmost individual freedom consistent with public welfare. So long as an interest is not abused it can be left to individuals, the government stepping in only when individual management fails or produces dangerous conflicts. The benefits of competition ought to be maintained, while the evils are eliminated. This emphasis on the freedom of the individual has thus far been dominant; but it is no less important that to the municipality and state be given whatever pertains peculiarly to them. Public interests may be committed to individuals or corporations because it is expedient to do so; but this ought never to be for private aggrandizement at the expense of the public. The management of such enterprises as are for the public ought to be in the hands of the public. If the city or state grants property and privileges to any corporation, then the control should be with the city or state, or at least such a supervis-

ion as will secure the interests of the public to the public. The question of ownership is altogether different; for that the public may not be prepared. A country road made by a few farmers may be private for awhile and then become public; so with many other interests, they may, in the course of time, pass from the individual to the social stage of control. Thus postal affairs can for awhile be left to individuals and then, in the process of evolution, pass wholly to the control of the state. At one time the collection of taxes is farmed out to individuals and afterwards assumed directly by the state itself.

There is no reason to believe that the evolution from individual to state control has reached its limits. Now as in the past it may be found that some things still in private hands or managed by corporations ought to be put under state control. We are but in the beginning of the era when there is a strong trend from individualization to socialization, and it would be hazardous to predict to what extent society will find it necessary to socialize objects. There can, however, be no doubt that deeper social study will show that the action of the state respecting industries is not to be merely formal, but must likewise pertain to the substance. The industries are the foundation on which society builds; and only the shallowest view can claim that the state is to concern itself about all other matters but such as are fundamental. The principle in socialization must, however, always be that society is to receive its dues without robbing the individual of his rights.

Regulation of Industries.

The regulation of industries, as intimated above, must not be confounded with *interference* with industries. Some speak of all state action in industrial pursuits as if necessarily an interference. But suppose the state protects and promotes industries, is that objectionable? It need

not undertake what individuals can do equally well or even better. But it cannot be doubted that there are industrial interests of a general nature which cannot be left safely to private control; then the government may be required to aid, to harmonize, and to regulate certain phases of industrial life. The individual interests themselves require this help so as to insure greater efficiency. Just what is needed cannot be definitely stated; it requires profound study and greater development than has yet been attained. The needs of industrial legislation are pressing; yet the temptation to haste must be resisted. The law may hinder where it aims to aid, and may even destroy the very life it wants to promote. Its purpose must always be to extend true freedom and promote energy and enterprise. Between absolute individual ownership and the proprietorship of the state there are various grades. Some public interests the state ought to supervise, seeing to it that the people receive their rights; thus it ought to see to it that only trustworthy insurance companies do business in a commonwealth, and the fraud of all corporations is to be made impossible. Other public interests the state can control; it can determine how far railroads and other corporations shall promote the welfare of the public, and how far they shall be free to exploit that public. Some things may be taken bodily, the state finding it necessary for the public welfare and the safety of the state to become the owner. In the direction of supervision and control and ownership we find a marked evolution of the state in the progress of history. But popular haste may be public waste.

Protection of Laborers.

With the existing institutions and the prevalent views in the United States and England on the relation of the state to the industries, there can be no doubt that the laborers in these countries are obliged to depend chiefly on themselves for protection. Even now, however, we can expect

the state to make the conditions of self-help more favorable than in the past. The advantage of labor bureaus has already been considered. The laws and all the institutions will be affected by the fact that the claims of society receive more attention, and that persons rise into greater prominence and power, stepping on things instead of being crushed by them. The conviction is growing that our situation is not a fate which dooms men, but that society can change the situation and that the state has a most important function in producing the change.

Men as practical as Bismarck, guided in their action by the emergencies which confront them, do not hesitate to emphasize the duty of the state to provide especially for the welfare of the laboring classes. The insurance of laborers was but the culmination of the many reforms that astute statesman planned in their behalf. Call him a monarchist and aristocrat, that only brings into a more striking light his theory of the state's mission toward the more needy citizens. He did not dread the charge of favoring state socialism, but rather welcomed it. Bitterly as he opposed the social democracy, and severe as were the repressive measures he adopted against it, yet he declared that the needs made evident by socialism must be met by reformatory processes. "A few drops of social oil will have to be added to the prescription of the state," he said. Not only did he advocate social politics, but gloried in the claim that he was its author. He went so far as to declare in parliament: "Unconditionally I recognize a right to employment." He said, "Give the laborer the right to employment so long as he is well, secure for him needed care when sick, and provide for him when old." Then, he thought, that with more Christian consideration for the toilers the social democrats would lose much of their influence. "I declare that it is the duty of the state to take care of its

helpless citizens," is one of his many utterances respecting what was called state socialism. "It belongs to the traditions of the dynasty I serve to care for the weak in the industrial conflict," is another. "Never have the kings of Prussia been especially the kings of the rich. Perhaps they will succeed in doing something to improve the condition of the laborers." He wanted the way to the throne kept open so that the complaints of the needy might reach the monarch. "We are not accustomed to treat as a trifle the complaints of poverty. . . . which may be wished from the standpoint of the rich." Distinctly he rejected the theory of "*laisser faire, laisser aller,* of the Manchester school, that each is to take care of himself as best he can, and that he who is not strong enough to stand is to be thrust down and trampled upon."

It may be as easy as it is thoughtless to dismiss such utterances, and the positive enactments in behalf of the laboring classes which they advocated, with the dictum: "Paternal government." Men who are not caught by empty phrases which take the place of thought cannot but wonder why a people having attained a maturity which can dispense with this paternal solicitude cannot provide for themselves as efficiently as such a government? If the people exercise authority, does not that argue in favor of such laws and such government as promote the highest welfare of the people? It is only people duped by those that legislate for them which submit to the outrages committed against them, instead of making such laws as protect the innocent, help the weak, punish the guilty, and distribute justice equally to all. Punitive laws are not against the good, but for the good and against the wicked; hence the wicked oppose them if righteous, as much as the good favor them.

Verily, it is too late to say that the protection of laborers is not a function of the state. Let the facts but tell their tale in America and in Europe. Everywhere capital, absorbed by the passion for gain, concerns itself little about the comfort, the health and morals of the laborers. Against the plea that protection is afforded by the humanity of our civilization and by Christianity, we have the appalling barbarity prevalent in the enlightened lands. The humane employers can be trusted, but respecting the rest more confidence is to be placed in the law. The severest legislation is necessary to regulate the sanitary conditions of mines, factories, and wherever laborers are employed. To the laws must be added inspectors who see to it that they are strictly executed. Even this may not avail. In some places special preparations are made for inspectors, whose coming is known beforehand, and the result is that they find things exceptionally good, instead of the usual condition.

The weak of course need most protection. The awful crimes committed in the past must be made impossible forever. The law should fix the age at which children can be employed, and determine their hours of labor and the kind of work. So the labor of women needs regulation. There is complaint that they enter into competition with men; but the same law of being and of well-being applies equally to them as to men. They would not make the competition so unfavorable if for the same kind and amount of work they received the same pay. Special laws in her own interest and for the sake of the rising generation should forbid her toil for a season before and after child-birth. She should be kept from night work, and sufficient rest should be secured between periods of labor. The question of morals is of utmost importance; the law can do something in determining the conveniences of factories and the rela-

tions of the sexes during employment, but it cannot do everything. It has been found that the danger is especially great when the home is far from the place of work and parties go to and from their labor in the dark. For all classes Sunday and night work should be limited to what is absolutely necessary. The hours of toil ought to be shortened; and as government fixes the hours of its employees, can it not fix the maximum of a day's labor in different employments? Twelve hours in some kinds of work are less wearing than six or eight in others. Every humane being must desire the hours of toil shortened as much as circumstances allow. Eight hours as the maximum seem reasonable now; if six would do, so much the better. The reduction of hours, however, does not receive encouragement from the way many laborers now spend their leisure. In numerous instances Sundays and holidays are most to be dreaded by the families of laborers and by the community. They are the days of drunkenness, of fights, of violence, and of crimes. The evils of the day of rest are often felt and observed for days afterwards. Many would undoubtedly abuse their increased leisure, just as now they abuse their spare hours. But it is admitted that men who overwork and are subject to great strain are in the very condition to seek satisfaction in the saloon and in the grossest pleasures. Excess of work fits them for other excesses of the worst kind. Those who employ to advantage their increased leisure would form the noblemen among the toilers and exert a marked influence on the rest. Humane efforts are to be made especially for the benefit of such as want to rise by helping themselves.

As the law is of special significance for the laborers who seek to attain a better condition, so it is of special importance to the honest and humane capitalist. It aims to suppress unscrupulous cunning and brutal greed, in the

interest of honest dealing. If ten manufacturers of shoes agree to reduce a day's work to eight hours, and another continues twelve at the same pay because he can find laborers, he may undersell the other ten and force them to increase the hours or quit the market. Out of twenty barbers nineteen agree to close their shops on Sunday. The twentieth keeps open, does a large business, and even during the week takes customers from the others because he shaves them on Sunday. The nineteeth man sees how this works and soon he also opens on Sunday. So the thing goes on till the agreement amounts to nothing; one unscrupulous man is stronger than the other nineteen. Here the necessity of a Sunday law is evident. It is known that during the hot season certain stores can close five days in the week, without loss, at 6 P. M. The same amount of business will be done and its distribution not affected. The employers and the employed are equally benefitted by the arrangement. If, however, one or two merchants keep open till ten, the advantage in their favor may be such as to force the others to do the same. Thus inhumanity has the advantage over humanity, and nothing but the law on the side of humanity can make it triumph.

Those who blame manufacturers and merchants for the prevailing disadvantage of laborers may themselves be to blame. Much of the fault is with the consumers. They do not inquire at what suffering and sacrifice articles are produced which are undersold; all they demand is cheapness, and cheapness may be robbery. One man can sell a shirt ten cents less than another, because he has robbed the poor woman who made it of that amount, and the consumer gets the sum of the robbery and the merchant gets the increase of custom. A commercial traveller increases his sale twenty-five thousand dollars in one year. He cuts the prices and gets the customers which others formerly

had. His firm cannot afford the loss occasioned by the reduction, so they, being jobbers, inform the manufacturers and ask for a reduction; the manufacturers cannot afford to do this without lessening the cost of manufacture by reducing the wages. Thus labor is cheapened because the goods that the consumer buys are cheapened. The process, however, is clear. Unless the consumer pays a fair price the laborer is in the end the real sufferer. Often the wrong is done thoughtlessly, the consequences not being apparent; but just because the process is complicated and not within the control of any individual, the law should protect laborers to the utmost. Laborers and labor organizations ought to do the rest. All the moral and legal forces of the community and of the state should be exerted to make dishonest cheapness at the expense of honest toil impossible. Just judgment will be much better distributed when it is once clearly seen how much of the evils of the situation are due to thoughtless and dishonest consumers.

Æsthetics.

There are still many benighted regions where men cannot be convinced that ethical considerations have anything to do with the industries. Still more difficult is it to convince such that business has any relation to æsthetics. Now, it happens that a people's moral standard and their ideals of beauty are among the chief tests of civilization. Where success in business means nothing but money making at all hazards, we cannot expect men to have regard for the appearance of their plants; but the communities and the authorities are supposed to have other than purely money considerations. In many places nuisances are only interfered with when complaints against them on sanitary grounds are made. Look at the facts. Prosperous capitalists maintain establishments whose outhouses and surroundings are so disgraceful as to drive all decency from the neighborhood. The proprietors them-

selves refuse to live in a region which is intolerable to refined senses; yet others are obliged to live there and behold the unsightly objects. If the owners have not enough personal respectability to keep their places somewhere near the border of decent civilization, they ought to be obliged by the self-respect of the community to maintain cleanliness and order. England and the United States boast of their advanced civilization; yet in their manufacturing districts they permit filth and disorder which would be impossible in many Continental regions. It will be a distinct advance of culture when society by means of legal enactments shall say that a man's business may be his own, but that he shall not pollute the neighborhood with that business, that he shall not depreciate the value of other people's property because his establishment is there, and that his own lack of taste and refinement shall not have a demoralizing influence on the entire community.

Every intelligent American knows the application of this theme to his own country. Nearly every rail road furnishes proof of the shameful neglect in respect to æsthetics. Frequently the stations of great corporations add powerful factors to produce a general impression of barbarism and the rule of brutes. Is there not public taste enough to make communities rise in indignation and demand at least passable cleanliness and a removal of the most revolting sights? The impudence of some railway authorities in asking respectable people to make pleasure excursions along their lines is sublime.

The same applies to stores and the streets where they are located. Perhaps we should get no hearing if we said that a man should be obliged to consider the feelings and interests of his neighbors before putting on a public highway a stable which in that locality is a nuisance; perhaps it is vain yet to say that when a man builds he ought to be

obliged to regard the character of the neighborhood, and not be permitted so to build as to spoil the whole region. Each builds for himself and as he pleases; but have the public taste and interest and convenience no rights? The time will perhaps come when our first cities will not permit the heterogeneous architectural abominations which now disgrace them. But this much can already be demanded: the pavements shall not be obstructed by lounging loafers, by store boxes, and by nut and fruit venders; the awnings shall suggest civilization rather than Bedouin Arabs; and the advertisements flung across streets and pavements shall be a little less obtrusive, to say nothing of truthfulness. The time may come when people of intelligence and respectability will severely avoid all firms which deface barns and houses and farms with their lying impudence.

Dissension Among Laborers.

Among the most serious difficulties in the way of legal enactments for the protection of labor is the dissension among laborers themselves. There is no doubt that every reasonable demand which they unitedly urge will eventually prevail. Great as are the advances which the laborers and labor organizations of England have made, one need but read Mr. Spyer's volume on "The Labor Question" in order to learn how little they and their friends are agreed on any policy affecting the improvement of the condition of the workingmen. Not only do their views respecting the method and means conflict, but sometimes also their interests, so that what is advantageous to one is held to be disadvantageous to others. Laborers are divided as to what should be left to organization and competition, and what should be done by law. Many even fear that an eight hour law as the maximum of a day's work might be an injury rather than a blessing. Great diversity also prevails

among laborers respecting the function of the state in assuming the ownership of land, of the means of transportation, and of various manufacturing industries, in making provision for the unemployed, in taking care of the poor, and in insuring the laborers against the infirmities of old age. So long as the laborers cannot agree respecting the means to secure their interests it can hardly be expected that satisfactory laws in their behalf will be enacted.

Conflicts and the State.

Self-interest is the most prevalent law for the conduct of individuals and classes. Each sees his own interest and is intent on its furtherance. The claims of others may be unseen, ignored, or trampled upon. Capital is bent on securing the interests of capital, labor is passionately resolute in promoting its own interests. Under such circumstances an appeal to force is inevitable. In labor conflicts the victory belongs to the party which has greatest strength and most endurance. No one who has followed these conflicts questions that their continuance in the future subjects our industries, society, aud the state to a strain which they cannot stand with safety. At any time an outbreak may occur which leads to violence, excess, and revolution. Is there, then, no other appeal in such emergencies than to prejudice and passion?

Yes, an appeal to the function of the state. The state is equally concerned for the welfare of all of its citizens. The sphere of its laws, its politics, its statesmanship is not a class or party, not the interest of one section to the neglect of another, but truth and right and justice. The state rises above party passion and prejudice by making ethical considerations supreme. Thus in the conflicts between capital and labor it sides with neither party, but takes an impartial standpoint, seeking to determine what belongs to each according to the principles of equity. Here is a higher law

than partisanship. With the party might makes right; with the state right makes might. A majority which uses the government selfishly and ignores the minority, is a usurper and promoter of anarchy. The state must insist on obedience to its laws, but it can thus insist only if justice is the sphere of its laws, not the whims, the follies, and the iniquities of parties.

The State and Municipality as Capitalists.

What the state and the municipality shall own is far less important for us than what they shall control. They may find it to their advantage to commit certain great enterprises to individuals and corporations; in that case it would be folly to assume the ownership at a loss to the public. Where, however, public conveniences committed to corporations mean public inconvenience and the robbery of the public, the duty is plain. Every corporation which seeks the welfare of the community ought to welcome public inspection and legal control, in the interest of the public. The evils of unconditionally committing general interests to individuals and corporations for selfish aggrandizement have become so flagrant that an indignant people demand redress. If public works involve a loss, the community ought to bear it; if they yield profit, the community ought to earn it; if they impose responsibilities, the community ought to assume them. This is so clear that the realization is only a question of time. The corporation which owns a public interest is an employee of the public and must be treated accordingly. If the public cannot supervise or control such interests when owned by corporations, then the public must become the proprietor. This applies to gas and water works, to street cars, to telephones, and to all public interests in a municipality. A city can remove the garbage and clean the streets, by contract; but the city must see to it that

the contract is fulfilled or it must do the work itself. The same principle applies to telegraphs and rail roads. The state owns these in Germany and other countries; they are regarded as largely a part of the postal system. The state needs them; the public needs them; hence they must be made most efficient for the state and the public. In Germany the rail-roads do not appropriate the land of the people. A credulous public is not robbed by the issue of worthless bonds and stocks. Useless competition for the waste of capital is not allowed, but a road is built where needed—if it does not pay by itself, it pays as a part of the great and harmonious network. The profits and losses are shared by the totality, for all the people are concerned. The tariffs of passengers and freight are not arranged by competition or by monopoly, not with a view to discrimination for or against a place, but for the good of all. This system of state ownership is not yet perfected, but its advantages are admitted to be great. Of the need of state control of rail roads, telegraphs, and other public interests there can be no question; respecting state ownership no consensus has been reached, but the preponderance of evidence is growing in its favor.

In his first annual report the Commissioner of Labor refers to one of the many benefits to be derived from the complete control or ownership by the state. "The state control of railroads in Belgium and Germany, it is considered, has done much to prevent the waste of capital upon the construction of useless parallel lines merely for speculative purposes, from which the United States has suffered." If there is no other way of checking the robbery of millions from the people, which has been systematically carried on for decades, than by state ownership, then the question is virtually settled. If great trusts and monopolies can control certain industries and destroy competition, why cannot

the state manage those interests which are not private, but pertain to the general public and on which public welfare depends? We cannot doubt that soon society will demand that every selfish monopoly shall be socialized by putting it under state control or ownership, or that some other method shall be found to make the benefits public.

Monopolization is a process of outwitting competition by means of competition. Capital competes with capital; the battle continues till one party is slain—that ends the competitive war. By putting a particular industry under one management production may be cheapened and consumers the gainers. But the monopoly can also control the amount of production and fix the price and rob the public. The means of securing the monopoly must likewise be considered, how much capital is destroyed by rendering plants useless, and how many men are ruined because in the way of monopolization. The revelations given in "Wealth Against Commonwealth," by Mr. Lloyd, are awful; they show that to this earth has come that hell in whose existence in the next world the faith of some has been waning. There are many proofs that the monopolists have the public by the throat, and it seems doubtful whether the grip can be loosened. Society, the judiciary, the legislatures and congress, the city, the state, the nation, are at the mercy of the combinations; and in some respects this mercy is of so infernal a nature that no language is strong enough to do it justice. It is already a serious question whether it will be possible to restrain the fiery indignation of the public when they behold the iniquities to which they have been subjected and the horrors by means of which these iniquities were perpetrated. A nation consisting of scores of millions governing themselves is sublime; but nothing in history is more terrible than an outraged people turned into a mob. If competition is the law of the indus-

tries, must not the municipality or state take possession of every monopoly which, in defiance of the law, destroys competition?

Private Property.

The limits of the distinction between thine and mine have been obscured in many minds and obliterated in others. This is partly due to the conviction that numerous possessions were not earned, and that many persons do not possess what they have earned. The reasons for this conviction can be found in any community. We take an illustration from a well known city. The richest families did not earn their wealth by labor in any true sense. Some obtained it by speculation or by means of a monopoly in minerals. Millions were appropriated as an unearned increment. The owners of land in the city withheld it from the market to the detriment of the community; then it was sold after the growth of the population had increased its value. The increment is a social increment, but it has become private property. Those who have the largest possessions never worked, but they inherited them. Much of this wealth is a curse to its possessors and the community. In other cases capital has increased by depressing the wages of labor. At the same time numerous families of means have obtained their possessions by organizing industries, by skill and energy and toil and sacrifice. When, however, actual investigation shows how much of the wealth is not really earned by those who possess it, the charge is not substantiated that the impoverished masses are coveting possessions they have not earned and want to take them from those who have earned them. This charge may apply to the indolent and worthless rabble, but not to diligent toilers.

The fact that much property is possessed by such as have not earned it has had the effect of an extensive ques-

tioning of the sacredness of property. Establish the title to property and there will be no difficulty about the respect for property in the public mind. The claims of property have been confused by the theory that all men have an equal right to all things. The right to private property needs thorough investigation and must be carefully discriminated from the wrongs now attached to such property. It has been said that a man must have something which he calls his own; this is demanded by his very existence and by the dignity of his personality. Property gives him power and influence and dominion; it is like his body, he uses it, he works through it upon others, and thus enlarges himself. But if a person needs property in order to be something and to do something, then *all* worthy ones ought to have it: an invincible argument in favor of such a distribution of possessions as will give to each his proper share. The man with property has a peculiar interest in affairs; he has more to lose than the non-possessor. Those who own nothing can more easily afford to be revolutionary, having nothing to lose, but cherishing the hope of gain. A large discontented, non-possessing class is a perpetual menace to the existing order of things. The increase of the number of possessors is demanded by wealth for its own safety. The effect of property on its owner is much greater than the influence of what is rented or borrowed. It apparently enhances the value of a man, it increases his importance among men, it exercises his care, and draws out and develops his energies.

But aside from considerations of utility, private property has weighty claims. Certain things belong to particular persons in a sense in which they cannot belong to others, and this gives them such a right to their possession as no one else can have. What a man makes is his in a sense in which it cannot belong to one who has nothing to

do with its creation. It is his product and he is its rightful owner. What a man earns ought to be his own; for another to appropriate it is robbery. What a man produces with his intellect and skill is no less his than the product of his manual labor; this justifies the protection and reward of inventions and the works of authors. Economy and sacrifice also give an especial claim. One man earns two dollars a day, uses half for the home and spends the rest in the saloon. Another earns the same amount, spends half for the home and puts the rest in a savings bank. At the end of a month the first demands one-half, twelve dollars, of the savings of the other, on the plea that property ought to be equally divided. The absurdity ls apparent. Certain claims are likewise based on discovery, foresight, risk, energy and enterprise, most of which, however, come under the head of intellect and earnings. Enough, such claims firmly establish the rights of some above all others to certain possessions, and thus furnish the basis for private property, a title which the prevalent abuses cannot invalidate. The defence of private property is among the state's most sacred duties; but in order to defend, it must discover the owner, and give to the true owner the property which others possess but have stolen from him. So rigidly must the state be the arbiter that individuals never have occasion to wrest possessions from one another by force.

Literature.

For the student of the Social Problem the theory of the state is indispensable. He ought to investigate the origin, the nature, the development and the functions of the state. There can be no question that the social progress of the future will lie largely along the line of civil government and institutions, the law and politics. The encyclopedias are, as a rule, very unsatisfactory on this subject, the article on Government in the Britannica not even giving the literature, but as an intro-

duction that article is useful. Of great importance are the recent discussions on the theory and functions of the state. Especially to be recommended are the works of Mohl, Holtzendorff, Bluntschli, and Gneist. The student will find Bluntschli, "The Theory of the State," translated, Clarendon Press, Oxford, very valuable. As a depository of the most advanced thought on the state and its varied functions, economic and social as well as political, the six large volumes of "*Handwœrterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*," G. Fischer, Jena, is unrivalled. It is edited by Professors Conrad, Elster, Lexis, and Lœning, of the universities of Halle, Breslau, and Gœttingen, assisted by hundreds of contributors in different countries from Germany to Japan. Henry Sidgwick, "Elements of Politics," Macmillan. Woolsey, "Political Science or the State," Scribner. Woodrow Wilson, "The State," D. C. Heath & Co., Boston. J. W. Burgess, "Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law," Guin & Co., Boston. W. W. Willoughly, "An Examination of the Nature of the State," Macmillan. Mulford, "The Nation," Hurd & Houghton, N. Y. Fiske, "Civil Government in the United States," Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The "Cyclopædia of Political Science, Political Economy, and of the Political History of the United States," M. B. Cary & Co., Chicago, edited by John J. Labor, contains numerous valuable articles by American and European authors. J. S. Hoffman, "The Sphere of the State or The People as a Body-Politic," Putnam's Sons, is a popular presentation of the subject, with special reference to present problems. J. R. Seeley, "Introduction to Political Science," Macmillan, is likewise popular.

On state socialism see Dawson, "Bismarck and State Socialism," Sonnenschein. The chapters on "The Socialists of the Chair," in Laveleye and Rae. Moritz Strœll, "*Die Staatsocialistische Bewegung in Deutschland*," Duncker

und Humblot, Leipzig. Other German literature in first note to Laveleye's chapter. Numerous English works discuss the relation of the state to the industries. "Fabian Essays." T. H. Farrar, "The State in Relation to Trade," Macmillan. Jevons, "The State in Relation to Labor," the same.

On English labor laws, George Howell, "Handy Book of the Labor Laws," Macmillan; on American, F. J. Stimson, "Hand-book of the Labor Laws of the United States," Scribner's Sons.

CHAPTER X.

THE FUNCTION OF THE STATE IN THE SOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM—CONCLUDED.

The Land Problem.

In the discussion of private property an unusual amount of attention has recently been paid to the possession of the land. This is quite natural as population increases, as uncultivated land decreases, and as rent advances. The land is limited; all the people depend equally on its products for a living; it is the sole source of the raw materials required by the industries; and one need but recognize its solitary importance to see that the tenure of the land is entitled to especial consideration. Monopoly in land involves the sovereignty of the monopolist and the complete subjection of the rest of humanity. The land being a necessity to all, it is a question of deepest interest whether nature is to be equally accessible to all, or whether a natural and divine right to it is conferred on a few, while the rest are excluded. If such a supreme and exclusive right of the few exists, it must be established beyond question; otherwise the disinherited will insist on sharing directly the benefits of nature.

Fortunately, amid the confusion of opinion respecting the ownership of the land, one thing is clear: since all equally depend on the land the benefits of this dependence must be secured to all. The most important question is not whether the ownership shall be individual or communal, but how the greatest individual and social blessings can be derived from the land. If in any way the land has been so individualized as to benefit some and rob others,

then a socialization is now demanded which will distribute the use and products of the land equitably. Land is more limited than air and its use requires labor; otherwise we cannot see why it should not be equally accessible to all as much as the air we breathe. The best use of the land for all is a problem of deepest import and of the greatest difficulty; it is far from being settled, and it is doubtful whether the data for its settlement are already within reach; and at the present stage of investigation it is manifestly wrong to attempt to settle with an unproved dogma or untested theory what necessarily involves much further inquiry and larger experience.

History of Property in Land.

The history of property in land has become a favorite theme, and scholars of high repute and of different nationalities have traced this history from the earliest records to the present time. Details are often lacking, but the general outlines are clear. In different ages and countries the proprietorship varied greatly, and different forms of ownership prevailed at the same time and in the same country. Originally proprietorship attached to movables, such as garments, implements, and cattle, rather than to land. Even this movable property was not necessarily personal, but to some of it applies what Sir Henry Maine says: "Property once belonged not to individuals, nor even to isolated families, but to large societies." For this whole subject it is important to remember that in ancient times the family, the tribe, or the community took the place of the individual; he was absorbed by the totality, and what he had was, like himself, a communal or tribal factor. The process of evolution has been a process of individualization; and as the individual became more independent of family and tribe, so did individual ownership take the place of family or tribal possession. So long as tribes were nomadic, depending

for their livelihood on hunting, fishing, and herds, they moved freely from place to place, as tempted by advantage and opportunity, using and abandoning at pleasure the land or expelling weaker hordes that were in their way. The account of Abraham and Lot, Genesis xiii., is an illustration of the ancient appropriation of land for herds. Permanent possession of land was more necessary when the people devoted themselves to agriculture, and became more numerous and less nomadic. The land could hardly be said to be owned; it was used by the tribe, was freely increased when needed, no one disputing the appropriation; each individual could probably get all he wanted, without specific communal division or allotment, and pass unhindered from one piece of unoccupied land to another. Occasion for private ownership, such as arose when the population became dense and land scarce, did not exist. Communal instead of individual possession, prevailed in ancient times, and extends to this day from India to Western Europe. In Russia it is known as the *Mir*. In the Rhone valley, Switzerland, the writer visited a village which owned the surrounding land; to each citizen was assigned a portion for tillage, each had a right to pasturage and to a certain amount of wood from the forest. No family was prominent through great wealth, poverty was little known and easily relieved when it occurred. The government retains the land in Java, leases it to individuals for a term of years, and appropriates the revenues for governmental purposes. From Scripture, from the remotest records, from Greece and Rome, and from general history we learn that there was private as well as public possession of land in olden times, the private ownership increasing in the process of individualistic evolution. It was common for the victors in a war to appropriate the land of the conquered; in earliest times the defeated were

frequently killed and eaten, but later they were enslaved, so as to till for the conquerors the soil taken from them. Perhaps the victorious leader divided the territory among his followers. Land was often taken arbitrarily in the Middle Ages, and as arbitrarily bestowed on feudal vassals in lieu of their allegiance to the donating lord.

In a word we can give the significance of the historical inquiry for our subject. History decides neither in favor of an exclusive communal, nor of an exclusive individual, ownership; it does not determine which is most rational or most advantageous to society; what was adapted to a past condition may not meet the demands of the changed conditions of the present; and why may not different forms of ownership be required to meet different existing peculiarities, just as they have been met in the past?

Nationalization of Land.

"Nationalization" of land is a misleading expression, and the implication involved in the term may vitiate the entire discussion of the land problem. Is not every foot of land in the United States national territory? When has an acre of it been denationalized, or by what means could it be done? So long as the nation is not destroyed its territory remains national; the supposition that any of its lands need nationalization implies that the nation has abandoned or lost prerogatives on which its very existence depends. The purchaser of land, from government or individuals, is not the absolute owner, for it continues to be national territory; in an inalienable sense the state or nation retains the ownership, but land is committed in trust to individuals. A man can transfer himself to a foreign country and become its citizen, and sell any products of soil or mine or industry to Europeans; but not an acre of land can he transfer to any foreign nation. It is not his to transfer; it belongs to the nation, and the nation alone can make the transfer.

Since the land is and must be national, something else than the term expresses is meant by the nationalization of the land; it means ownership by the state alone or its equivalent. Private ownership now is not entire national alienation; but by nationalizing the land men mean that the national alienation is not to be as complete as by instituting individual proprietorship. The use of the term may imply that the nation's relation to its land must change in order to derive a just tax from that land. This implication is false. Never has the nation assumed such a relation to its territory that it cannot tax the land in the way required by justice, by society, and by the needs of the nation. This simplifies the problem. Nationalization of land is sometimes interpreted to mean the confiscation of the rent of land, which is called an unearned increment, as a government tax. We prefer to call it a "social" increment. Land, being limited, rises in value with the increasing population; this rise, being the result of the growth of population, it is claimed, ought to accrue to the benefit of the society which increased the value of the land. It is held that in appropriating the rent society but takes its own. Those who hold that labor is the sole source of value must of course show what labor society has performed to earn the increment.

Let us look a little more closely at this unearned or social increment. We have maintained the right to tax the land so far as just and necessary; but the matter assumes a new shape when the social increment is made the measure of that tax. Was the land sold or bought on condition that this increment be given as a tax? Did the government at any time recognize private ownership of land as dependent on this condition? If the purchaser and the government had no such understanding, is it not the violation of contract for one party to make such a provision now

by which it is benefitted but the other injured? The very existence of a state involves taxation, so that no difficulty exists on that score. But if the social increment shall be taken from land, why not then take the social increment wherever found? A manufacturer in a small community has an annual profit of one thousand dollars; in ten years, through the growth of population and the consequent increase in demand, his profits are ten thousand dollars; is not that a social increment? The same is true of lawyers, doctors, and other professional men. It is claimed that in England, Sweden, and Belgium the land is not as profitable an investment as the industries, and in other countries this is no doubt also the case. No peculiarity of proprietorship in land makes it apparent why a rent of five per cent., which is a social increment, should be taken, and why industries which yield a profit of twenty per cent., a large part of which is also a social increment, should remain untouched. Not a word need be said about confiscation which violates a solemn contract. As society is one party to the contract, it ought to respect that contract, as well as fix its attention on the social increment. It ought to be the rule that all shall be treated alike; if in one case the social increment is the measure of the tax, then let it be so likewise in other cases, no discrimination being made for or against the land or the industries. While rejecting the single tax theory as unjust, we reject the nationalization of land, in the literal sense, as absurd, as attempting to establish a condition which has never ceased to exist. Land need not be nationalized to be taxed; but it can be taxed already because it is national property.

Evident as this is, there can be no question that a city might be better off if it owned all the land on which it is

built.* Here the social increment is most apparent. A man with a thousand acres worth five thousand dollars, may become a millionaire without earning a penny of the increase. I buy from him a lot for one hundred dollars; after improving it I want to buy the next lot, and he asks two hundred dollars. That is, I am to pay for the second lot the value which I myself have given it. A friend of mine wants a third lot, and he is asked to pay three hundred dollars, and so on. Sometimes owners of lots refuse to sell, and thus hinder the development of cities because they want to harvest the future increment created by society. But what shall be done? Shall a city buy all the land? It might be a good investment; but it would be a great undertaking to manage it, just as it would be an enormous task for the United States to be the sole owner of all its vast territory. The only way that now seems just is to tax property without confiscation and without violation of past contracts. If the social increment generally can be determined, let it be taxed, but taxed equally.

The single tax theory has created much interest in England and on the Continent, as well as in the United States; but it has lost in popularity because it does not meet the claims made for it. It is much better adapted to countries like England and Scotland, and states like California, where great tracts of land are in the hands of a few,

* This was the conviction of J. S. Mill as expressed in his last public utterance on the land problem, found in *The Examiner* (London,) January 4 and 11, 1873. He there argues that the social increment in city lots ought to go to the city. "If the Grosvenor, Portman and Portland estates belonged to the municipality of London, the gigantic incomes of these estates would probably suffice for the whole expense of the local government of the capital. But these gigantic incomes are still swelling; by the growth of London they may again be doubled, in as short a time as they have doubled already; and what have the possessors done, that this increase of wealth, produced by other people's labors and enterprise, should fall into their mouths as they sleep, instead of being applied to the public necessities of those who created it?"

than as a principle of general application. It seems that the best way of socializing land and lots remains yet to be discovered; but when discovered and demonstrated, there can be no doubt that society will be prepared to adopt it. Society has the right, and about the might there is no question.

Taxation.

The question of taxation is as vast as it is important. Shall it be direct or indirect? Often the indirect taxes are the severest burden on the people, but the evils are not so obtrusive as in the case of direct taxation and seem mitigated by the fact that they fall on all. Thus revenues derived from salt, breadstuffs, and meats, affect all, but not equally. The rich man eats meat and wheat bread, and uses salt, just as before; but the poor man uses less salt, may use rye instead of wheat, has little meat, perhaps only horse flesh, as is often the case in continental Europe, and may be obliged to subsist mainly on potatoes. So far as possible, the indirect taxes ought to be on luxuries, not on the necessaries of life. The direct taxes ought likewise to be so distributed that the poorer classes and those dependent on a wage are least affected by them. It goes without saying that every honest citizen *insists* on paying for the support of the government according to its claims and his ability. He must sin against his own conscience if he does not pay according to the possession which the state holds for him and according to the income which it enables him to make. Rich men who refuse to do this not only present a sight more pitiable and despicable than can be found in the slums, but they lay the track on which revolution threatens to run its course. For perjury in trifling affairs in courts of justice men are sent to the penitentiary; but perjury respecting possessions and incomes, even on the part of men "called" good, has become so common that hardly anything else is expected.

In the United States the evils in this respect are very serious. Professor Ely says: "A study of taxation is calculated to give one a rather pessimistic view of American laws, American institutions, and American character. As soon as one begins to examine the facts respecting taxes and tax payers in our cities, one discovers that many an advocate of governmental reforms, loud in his professions, is as unscrupulous a tax-dodger as any unregenerate politician of the 'spoils' school; that many a man who plumes himself on the soundness of his Christianity, is but too ready to browbeat the tax-assessor and shift his just burden to the shoulders of the weak and defenceless; that many a one who figures in the lists of donors to charitable and philanthropic institutions, gives, after all, only a part of what he has withheld from the public treasury. On the other hand, it is encouraging to find rare instances of men of wealth who do not avail themselves of the means at their command to evade taxes, and who bear heavy burdens placed upon them by an antiquated and iniquitous system of taxation." * Mr. Bryce † quotes the Connecticut Commissioners to this effect: "Bonds and notes held by an individual are for the most part concealed from the assessors, nor do they in most towns make much effort to ascertain their existence. The result is that a few towns, a few estates, and a few persons of a high sense of honesty, bear the entire weight of the tax. Such has been the universal result of similar laws elsewhere." That is, the laws on taxation are evaded, and the conscientious people must pay for such as defraud the government. The West Virginia tax commission of 1884 is quoted as follows: "At present all taxes from invisible property come from a few conspicuously conscientious citizens, from widows, executors, and from guardians of the

* "Taxation in American Cities and States," Preface.
† "American Commonwealth," I. 494.

insane and infants; in fact, it is a comparatively rare thing to find a shrewd trader who gives in any considerable amount of notes, stocks, or money." Returning to Connecticut, Mr. Bryce states that "the probate inventories of the estates of deceased persons, and the last returns made to the tax assessors by those persons, 'show, to speak of it mildly, few points of contact.' Connecticut is a commonwealth in most respects above the average. In every part of the country one hears exactly the same. The tax returns sent in are rarely truthful; and not only does a very large percentage of property escape its lawful burdens but the demoralization of the public conscience by the frequent administration of oaths, so often taken only to be disregarded, is an evil of the greatest magnitude." To this statement respecting Connecticut, based on the report of the Commissioners, we add the statement, on the very next page, taken from the message of the Governor of Ohio in 1887: "The great majority of the personal property of this State is not returned, but entirely and fraudulently withheld from taxation. The idea seems largely to prevail that there is injustice and inequality in taxation, and that there is no harm in cheating the State, although to do so a false return must be made and perjury committed. This offence against the State and good morals is too frequently committed by men of wealth and reputed high character, and of corresponding position in society."

When such a condition is general throughout the Union it is a fearful commentary on the moral standard. Is it any wonder that with such facts before them the laboring men should be indignant, and declare that wealth held and used on such principles is too corrupt to be worthy of preservation, and that it is very questionable whether a government which tolerates such fraud and perjury ought not to make room for one which promotes honesty and preserves the sanctiy of the oath?

Mines.

There is one subject that has received but little attention which is, however, of great importance. When the state sells the surface of the land it ought to reserve for the people the valuable minerals that may be found below the surface. If a man discovers gold or silver, let him be rewarded for the discovery; but if he has not paid for it, why should he appropriate what belongs to the people or the nation? There would be no injustice if the sale of land were made with that understanding. There is little interest in the subject now; it is thought that the nation is the loser, and the nation is taken as an abstraction. But it is the people themselves who are the losers; and when they realize of what they are deprived without compensation, their indignation will burst forth. The gold, the silver, the copper, the lead, the iron, the coal, the oil, belong to the nation and ought never to have been taken from the people without an equivalent. The government might need no other backing for its finances and no other resources for its expenses than these treasures. There is an undue haste in the development of our national resources if that development means the impoverishment of the nation for the sake of enriching a few or creating great monopolies. The time will come when the loss thus sustained by the public will be deemed one of the most serious ever met with.

Limitation of Individual Wealth.

Marvelous is the apathy of the people in view of the loss sustained by giving, without remuneration, to individuals the minerals which belong to the public; hardly less surprising is it that the limitation of individual wealth is not more frequently discussed. For final decision we are probably less prepared than on the land problem; here the subject of this limitation is introduced merely by way of suggestion and for study. The

author professes to be simply an inquirer into the matter, and it would be presumptuous to attempt more than a meagre and tentative treatment; he is, however, convinced that the time has fully come when the theme demands thorough and fearless investigation, though the decision must be left to the future.

The evils and dangers of great concentration of wealth have furnished a common theme for ancient as well as modern philosophers and moralists. All the world knows that excessive riches often enervate families, ruin children, prove a pest to communities, and demoralize states. Now that the social element has been discovered in capital and labor, in wealth and in poverty, the glaring contrast between the rich and the poor is a source of irritation and a menace to peace and order. No prophetic insight is required to see that on this rock the ship of state is in danger of being wrecked. Basing his views on history, on economics, on politics, on ethics, and on the trend of the present, so earnest a writer as Laveleye can look only with painful apprehensions into the future. A few quotations are given from the preface to his "Primitive Property." "Instead of the quarrels of princes or dynastic rivalries, we now have a far more formidable source of war,—the enmity of races, which arms whole nations for the struggle. If no new breath of Christian charity and social justice come to calm all these hatreds, Europe, amid the struggles of class with class and race with race, is threatened with universal chaos. . . . How to reconcile absolute liberty with the maintenance of established order in society, and how to enable the inequality of conditions, which is declared to be necessary, to exist side by side with the political equality which is conferred, is the formidable problem which modern societies must solve under pain of perishing like those of ancient times. . . . Either you must establish a more equita-

ble division of property and produce, or the fatal end of democracy will be despotism and decadence, after a series of social struggles of which the horrors committed in Paris in 1871 may serve as a foretaste. . . . Economists reiterate that all property is the result of labor; and yet, as before, under the empire of existing institutions, those who labor have no property and with difficulty gain the bare means of subsistence, while those who do not labor live in opulence and own the soil. As the former class compose the great majority, how can they be prevented from using some day the preponderance at their disposal in an endeavor to altar the laws which regulate the distribution of wealth so as to carry into practice the maxim of St. Paul, 'whosoever does not labor shall not eat.'" Amid the multitude of similar or even stronger statements but one more is selected: "The destiny of modern democracies is already written in the history of ancient democracies. It was the struggle between the rich and the poor which destroyed them, just as it will destroy modern societies, unless they guard against it. In Greece equal rights were granted to all the citizens. But ancient legislators did not fail to recognize the fundamental truth, so constantly repeated by Aristotle, that liberty and equality cannot exist without equality of conditions. . . . Note the ominous words of Plato: 'Each of the Greek states is not really a single state, but comprises at least two; one composed of the rich, the other of the poor.' . . . At Rome, as in Greece, inequality, after stifling liberty, destroyed the State itself."

Laveleye is but one of a multitude of writers whose serious warnings oblige the thoughtful student to consider the chaos to which the great inequalities in conditions

seem inevitably to tend.* How long can a republic stand the strain? Any longer than till the people realize that the political and martial power is in their hands? So long the case, with the present awakened consciousness of the masses, is hopeless as J. S. Mill's words remain true: "All privileged and powerful classes, as such, have used their power in the interest of their own selfishness, and have indulged their self-importance in despising, and not in lovingly caring for those who were, in their estimation, degraded, by being under the necessity of working for their benefit."

Men are not only pondering whether the existing condition, with its fearful inequalities, is worth preserving, but millions in different nations have answered that it is not, and have resolved its destruction. The question of rights is likewise involved. What law of nature or of God justifies a superfluity uselessly hoarded or destructively used, while others suffer from want of food or of opportunities for a successful life? Multitudes insist on asking whether a man can really earn millions, or whether they are not a

---

* Rousseau, "Social Contract," Chap. II., says: "As to riches, no citizen should be opulent enough to be able to purchase another, and none poor enough to be obliged to sell himself." In a note he adds: "If you would give stability to the state, bring the extremes as near together as possible; allow neither rich nor poor. These two conditions, naturally inseparable, are equally dangerous to the common good; from one come the abettors of tyrrany, and from the other,—tyrants; between them the traffic in public liberty is carried on: one buys, the other sells." Translation of Rose M. Harrington.

The danger in these extremes is evident. Would it be possible to make private wealth a social blessing instead of a selfish possession? Or could the extremes be avoided without confiscation, and without direct legal enactments on the subject, by simply establishing just laws for the acquisition and holding of private property? An unjust social condition may rob one to enrich another; but if in a just social condition a man actually earns riches, why should he not possess them? These are among the perplexing questions which must be considered and answered. Some men are poor because idle and vicious, and they deserve their poverty; others are industrious and yet live from hand to mouth; some are idle and revel in luxuries.

private appropriation of social earnings. Nothing but fatuous ignorance of the people will tolerate accumulations which are stored-up fraud instead of stored-up labor and earnings. Somebody earned the "unearned" increment; that somebody must be found and made the possessor. The people find it impossible to separate the undue concentration of wealth in one hand from its withdrawal from other hands. The water gathered in a reservoir, unless directly created, must be withdrawn from some other source or sources; and it cannot remain thus concentrated and at the same time be distributed through the city. If this concentration and withdrawal are known to be the result of wild speculation, of railroad wrecking, of fraud, of any dishonest transaction, the public feel the more keenly the outrage to which they are subject. Largely in Europe, and to some extent also in America, there are great possessions which cost their holders no effort, while millions of toilers have a bare livelihood, or actually suffer from lack of the necessaries of life.

Great capitals likewise have special advantages for increasing. The man with a million dollars has an enormous advantage over a man with twenty thousand, yet his family expenses may not be greater. If both possessions increase fivefold in the same time, the one will have five millions when the other has one hundred thousand dollars. This increase may go on from generation to generation; shall it be permitted to proceed endlessly? Suppose a multi-millionaire buys the land of Bohemia; can he turn it into a private hunting park, expel the people, and cultivate animals in their stead? That has actually been the process in some countries. "In the general interests of the country," says John Burns respecting England, "something must be attempted to prevent the land lying idle. Year by year the community looks on as field after field is added to

sporting estates and men give way to deer. In many country districts peasants rot whilst the pheasants rule; and game is master where man is hunger's sport."

It cannot be questioned that the individual possession of land ought to be limited, the conditions in England and Scotland and some other countries being intolerable in this respect. Entails have likewise become impossible, at least in a republic. No man can be permitted so to bind up his possessions that all future generations shall be obliged to hold them intact, no one being allowed to touch them even in case of debt, and all for the sake of making a name for himself and securnig forever to his heirs unearned dominion or idleness.

Concentration of Wealth and Crises.

During seasons of business prosperity the evils of the excessive cencentration of wealth are not so apparent. Money invested in the industries benefits the community and helps the laborer. It proves a blessing, though it is not clear why it would not be a still greater blessing if more evenly distributed. But when a financial crisis comes the evils of the concentration are most striking. Let us take a community of one thousand families. If one man owns a million dollars and employs the rest of the community, their livelihood may be assured in prosperous times. But what will become of the nine hundred and ninety-nine families in a crisis? They have not saved much, they are out of employment. The one rich man has a million or more laid away on which he lives. He spends money only for what he consumes. One reason for hard times is that there are so few consumers. If now the thousand families had the million dollars equally divided among them, each would have one thousand dollars. That is, all could be consumers and the million dollars would be circulated instead of hoarded; and this very circulation

would create a demand for supply, and would serve to promote manufacturing and business. How can business revive so long as consumers have not the means to consume and purchase? It will yet be discovered that the problem of hard times is largely a problem of the excessive concentration of wealth.

Great Enterprises.

Certain great enterprises require a capital of millions; how could they be carried on if individual wealth were limited? Why not by means of stock companies, as is now so often the case? If enterprises promise well there is no reason why the sum required should not be advanced by the men among whom the wealth is distributed. The limitation of individual wealth is of course not a limitation of wealth itself; that might even be increased by the process. Enterprises of great magnitude, of general interest, and with no promise of an immediate return on the investment, are undertakings which may belong to the public or the state. The way for this is rapidly being prepared by the processes of monopolization.

Ability and Ambition.

In an age whose worship is golden there are likely other reasons than those mentioned for an avoidance of the serious consideration of this subject. Some are afraid that society would lose the advantage of the consecration of marked ability to business pursuits. There are organizers of great industries, and it is thought that their energies might be lost to the community if a limit were set to their accumulations. Men enter business for the sake of gain; only idealists are apt to underestimate the passion for money. This passion is developed by exercise, and its gratification is the strongest spur to business energy. Let us suppose that those who have been successful in reaching the limit retire from business, which need not, however, be the case;

what will the social effect be? It is admitted that there may be scores or hundreds, in the various communities, whose ability is equal to theirs, who need only proper opportunities to come to the front. Such opportunities would be increased by preventing monopolization; there would be more demand for eminent business ability and energy, and the demand would develop them. The probability therefore is that the business efficiency of the community would be increased.

But the most serious objection is that business would suffer because men would lose their ambition to accumulate. We may rest assured that this objection is invalid. It could apply only to such as had reached the limit; until that is the case the ambition to accumulate would continue. Is not inordinate greed admitted to be a dire curse of modern society? Up to a certain point the desire for accumulation is an individual and social necessity; but when it becomes limitless it is a consuming passion and both a personal and a public injury. The very opportunities given to others would save the industrial pursuits from stagnation. So far as history and the present teach any lessons on the subject we must conclude that the danger of the nations is not in the limitation of individual wealth, but in its concentration and endless accumulation. The difficulty in overcoming this danger consists largely in the fact that men are afraid to do what they are convinced ought to be done.

Some will dismiss the limitation of individual wealth with the thoughtless remark that it is nothing but a wild socialistic scheme. This is a mistake; serious men, earnest in the attempt to solve the Social Problem, far removed from socialism, are beginning to wonder whether such limitation is not a necessity. In *Die Gegenwart*, July 22, 1893, one of the most solid and least socialistic of German

journals, we read: "Let at last an ultimate limit be fixed which no one shall be allowed to pass without giving the surplus to the imperial treasury. This determination of the highest limit of wealth would be the simplest and most righteous of all laws hitherto passed. But it ought to come quickly. Already very perceptibly has the revolution rapped at the door; if it stands already in the shattered door, then it is too late, then that revolution will pass unheeded such 're-actionary trifles.'....So much money (several millions) no man needs as long as he is physically and mentally healthy. The middle class also knows that the great discoverers and inventors have nothing in common with upstarts and speculators....A superfluity of coin has always enervated and destroyed the aspiring mind, just as an excess of need." * Another writer, in the leading economic journal of Germany, says: "The prevention of great difference in possessions is the principal thing in democracies." This is not to be accomplished, he thinks,

* In "*Die Deutsche Rundschau*" for April, 1894, p. 41, Professor A. Wagner is mentioned as holding that there are not only such as have too little income and property, but also such as have too much and improperly acquired possessions. He says: "Millionaires, particularly such as the modern ones, are an excrescence, a social disease, just as the proletariat." He thinks healthy social politics in duty bound, not only to elevate and insure the income of the poorer classes, but also to check, and eventually to decrease, directly and indirectly, the income and possessions and economic dominance of the upper layers of the present acquiring classes. In order to prevent the existing glaring contrasts he believes that a new system for distributing the national income may be required.

The writer who quotes the views of this eminent economist continues: "Various indications give evidence that these views have already begun to influence practical politicians. Thus the leader of the German Reform Party declared in Parliament, June 26, 1893, that an actual social reform could only be spoken of if the growth (of the large possessions) was made impossible by means of taxation." In the Programme of the German Evangelical Labor Association, of June, 1893, we read: "We behold in the increasing concentration of capital in a few hands a serious economic misfortune. Therefore we request the state not to promote the same, but to oppose it in every legal way, not excepting taxation." The writer also affirms that the trend of many Austrian politicians is in the same direction.

by forcible means, such as Lycurgus adopted, but by means of taxation. Von Scheel, an economic writer of repute, holds that inequality in possessions is opposed to the idea of social justice, and to the striving after equality, which he pronounces an unmistakable trend of our age, a trend already expressed in the equality of all before the law. Concentrated capital, he says, is able to absorb smaller possessions and to make their owners dependent. But such a relation of dependence is abnormal and threatening, always promoting in the poorer classes the tendency toward revolution. Hence he holds that it is unquestionably the duty of the modern state to oppose these inequalities and their increase, by means of industrial legislation.

The fear of injury from the decrease of the desire for accumulation is not shared by J. S. Mill. He says that in England "the spirit of accumulation in the more prosperous part of the community requires abatement rather than increase." This applies fully as much to the United States as to England. He also says: "In England, it is not the desire of wealth that needs to be taught, but the use of wealth, and appreciation of the objects of desire which wealth cannot purchase, or for attaining which it is not required. Every real improvement in the character of the English, whether it consist in giving them higher aspirations, or only a juster estimate of the value of their present objects of desire, must necessarily moderate the ardor of their devotion to the pursuit of wealth." Covetousness would be modified by culture. "The intensity of devotion to industrial occupations would indeed in many cases be moderated by a more liberal and genial mental culture."

How Limit.

Since the whole subject is here treated tentatively, with the conviction that there are serious difficulties in the way, it is not necessary to discuss what the limit of individual possession

ought to be. Some day it may be possible to determine more definitely what an individual can appropriate without defrauding society. Montesquien defines luxury as "founded merely on the conveniences acquired by the labor of others;" and surely the least now required is that the labor which produces the conveniences shall be amply rewarded with the necessaries of life before others revel in superfluities and luxuries. Indications are at hand that the time may come when men of wealth will regard the limitation as the smaller evil. The subject must be fully considered, let the final decision be what it may. Besides the absolutely necessary limitation in the possession of land, all dishonest gains ought to be rigorously prevented. Men must have all they earn and nothing besides; then nothing will go to those who earn nothing. A man's social duties must correspond strictly with his ability. Taxes ought to be according to possession, as stated above. Does not social responsibility involve limitation of individual accumulation? There is surely no question that the man who can well afford taxes ought to pay more than the man who cannot afford them. Reward individual energy, but also the society which gives it the sphere for exercise. If society fixes a limit to an individual's accumulations, equally applicable to all, why should any member of society complain? But would not such a limitation involve confiscation? Not necessarily; it might go into operation after a man's death and thus not affect the present generation. It may be found to be a social necessity; and if a competence is still left, as might be the case, ought not the need of society to be considered and the individual submit to it? Surely these are points eminently worthy of consideration. Some will turn from them, others may be angry because the subject is even tentatively referred to; but there are others who are determined to fathom the matter to the bottom, be

the results what they may. It is the better part of wisdom to weigh the subject impartially, viewed from every side, with the sole purpose of discovering what is true and right and expedient.

Inheritance.

Some advocate that men be allowed to accumulate as much as they please, but that the amount of the inheritance to any one individual be limited. The heirs, it is said, did not earn what they inherit; they did not possess it before, and therefore to be deprived of it cannot so deeply affect them as would be the case if they had earned it and had had the enjoyment of it. In some quarters there is a decided opposition to all inheritance, on the plea that a man should possess only what he personally earns. Another objection urged is that it gives some men, regardless of labor and merit, a decided advantage over others at the very start, and enables them to live without useful effort. This ability to live in indolence and pleasure often destroys ambition, deadens energy, prevents the development of character, and proves detrimental to the community as well as to the individual. On the other hand, a man who brings children into being ought to make provision for them; and if they have shared his fortune during his life, shall they be deprived of it at his death? A great spur to industry and economy is given by the fact that the family is to share in the benefits after the decease of the accumulator. These are strong reasons for inheritance; but they do not prove that the impulse to accumulation should be all-absorbing and limitless, and that an unlimited amount ought to be transmitted to heirs. The man who fits his children to provide for themselves blesses them and the community much more than the one who inspires his children with the hope of a fortune and makes them indolent by depriving them of the necessity to work. Inheritances ought not to

be wholly abolished; but no more ought they to be permitted to lame energy, destroy ambition, encourage indolence, and foster dangerous inequalities in communities. In a country where honors, degrees and titles are not hereditary, it may well be questioned how far the more real and even more dangerous conditions of aristocracy shall be severed from personal merit and achievement, by making them hereditary. The man who inherits twenty-five millions and doubles the sum, transmits this to his oldest son who also doubles it and transmits one hundred millions, and so on, starts a process of growing concentration of wealth which will speedily establish a condition of things most of all to be deplored in a republic.

This matter is simplified by the recognition of the part taken by society in respect to inheritances. The whole transaction is no less social than individual. The deceased transmits nothing. The property a man leaves is transmitted by society; and society must decide how and what it will transmit. The amount concerns it deeply, and it claims the right to a voice in inheritances. Shall millions go to an heir whose essence is corruption? How far shall society promote social inequalities which have no basis in work and character? Society must surely be master of its own transactions in this matter. This principle is generally recognized. The government which transmits the property to heirs determines who the heirs shall be in case a man dies intestate; and it fixes the tax to be paid on the inheritance. In some cases the tax in Europe amounts to ten per cent. The government can regulate the tax according to the degree of the relationship of the heir and also according to the amount of the inheritance. In a number of European countries changes have recently been made in the laws of inheritance, and in the United States there are marked differences in the inheritance laws of the different

states. Evolution in the laws of inheritance has been in progress for some time and it is sure to continue. That same society which says that a foolish father shall not disinherit his family for the sake of a favorite who dupes him, can also determine what limits to inheritances are demanded by individual and social welfare. Even if there is some limit, that will not establish absolute social equality. The heirs will still have an advantage over such as inherit nothing, but there will not be the fearful inequalities which now prevail. Special provision might be made for the weak and imbecile, they not having the same chance to provide for themselves as the strong. Those who are energetic and vigorous will take pride in being the arbiters of their own fortune; their independence is superior to dependence. If inheritance is limited, the parents will be more apt to fit their children for useful occupations; the fathers will train the sons to greater independence, and there will be a tendency to make them more fully sharers in the business and fortune of the father during his lifetime. Instead of keeping all till his death, he would likely give them more during life and aid them in its management. He would have abundant opportunity to make them partakers of his fortune aside from the limited inheritance he could leave them. If the amount of the individual wealth were limited, and if the inheritance were limited to one fourth or one fifth of that amount, there would still be spur enough to the heir to try to reach the limit of wealth.

Tentative.

All here said with respect to the limit of inheritance is tentative, just as the discussion of the limitation of wealth. It is folly to insist on all possible equality of opportunity and then to resist the very efforts that will promote this equality; it is folly to lament the excessive concentration of wealth and yet refuse to adopt the means to prevent this concentration; and it is

simple madness to admit the existing evils and at the same time deprecate the fullest and most impartial discussion of the remedies. Unlimited accumulation and unlimited inheritance have the field; some arguments against them have been presented in order to show that their continuance is not so axiomatic as some seem to think. It must be shown that there are arguments against this continuance before men will even inquire into the matter. We ask for a searching inquiry, free from prejudice and passion, dominated neither by tradition nor by dogmatism, but intent on a complete and fair consideration of all points and all interests. We want wealth and prosperity, but distributed as extensively and equitably as possible.

Benefit to Laborers.

What benefit to laborers would this limitation of individual wealth and of inheritances be? The social contrasts would not be as great as at present, and the laborers would not be so completely under the dominion of a few great capitalists. Besides, the money in excess of the limitation of individual wealth and of the lawful inheritance would go to the public. It could be set apart especially for the more needy classes, for their higher education, for libraries, apparatus, and various institutions for their benefit, for parks, for asylums, and for the insurance of laborers. Much that now goes to speculation, to fraud, to monopolies, to luxury, to heirs who have not earned a penny of it, would go to those who do not get their full share of the national growth in wealth, and who ought by all means to have enough before others have a superfluity. The right can hardly be questioned; the might is with society; shall not the might go with the right?

Result.

Have we solved the Social Problem? Very, very far from it. The solution cannot be accomplished by words or theories or systems; these can at best but show the way that must be taken to reach the solution. What is needed for the actual solution is actual work. If the way now to be taken is seen, then by walking in it the way itself will become more clear. What we have learned has but prepared us to refrain from dogmatizing and to become more earnest as learners. We have studied to study, we have gained light to strive for more light. We have not deceived ourselves respecting the vastness and difficulty of the problem; hence we have cherished no vain hopes of an easy solution. With the study of the subject the difficulties have become more apparent; with increased study they may continue to increase. No sudden, violent solution is possible; that is settled. The only way to success is by means of evolution, and the needed revolutions must be by the process of slow, gradual, thorough evolution. After all that is possible has been done there will still be enough to lament and reform. We aim at the realizations which are possible, not at Utopias. Respecting our Social Problem we merely ask that what can be done justly be honestly undertaken. We want to get out of the spasmodic and one-sided efforts at solution into regular, systematic, and all-sided efforts. We want a change both of men and conditions; and to bring this about by means of evolution we must have the co-operation of all the good factors and forces of society. The evolution must be individual, social, national, and international; it must be intellectual, moral, religious, industrial, and political. It will be a failure unless it is inner and personal, elevating and ennobling the individual; and it will prove incomplete unless it changes relations and institutions, making the environment more favorable and human condi-

tions more equitable. As thus our problem includes the material affairs, and all human interests, from the lowest to the highest, which are based on these affairs; as it includes laborers and capitalists and all the various conditions in the inequalities of society: so it affects all individual, social, and political interests, the church, the state, all social relations, and civilization itself. We emphasize the state as so important a factor in the solution because it includes all the other factors and is the final authority to which they appeal. We see the hope of a solution in a socialization which avoids all communistic extremes, which roots selfishness out of the existing individualism, which fosters individuality without egoism, which encourages an altruism which conserves the rights of the personality, and which exalts society by giving to the individual what belongs to the individual, and which exalts the individual by giving to society what belongs to society.

No one who understands the subject and the development attained by the human mind in its investigation can claim finality for his discussion of the Social Problem. The highest claim made by the author for this volume is that it contains a *programme*, not ready for final adoption and action, but as a basis for discussion, as giving outlines still to be filled, as furnishing suggestions for acceptance or rejection as further inquiry shall prove advisable, and as presenting certain conditions according to which future investigations may be conducted.

NOTE.—The organization and regulation of industries by the state are of such fundamental importance that no doubt should be left respecting the correct theory. In the United States the let-alone theory has had its day, excepting such persons as cling to it for traditional reasons rather than from rational considerations. They can be left with their *laisser faire* doctrine, the inquirer devoting all his

attention to the character and amount of the needed industrial legislation of the state. Mr. Woodrow Wilson speaks of the past regulation of labor and adds: "Apparently, however, all past regulation of labor was but timid and elementary as compared with the labor legislation about to be tried by the governments of our own day. The birth and development of the modern industrial system has changed every aspect of the matter; and this fact it is which reveals the true character of the part which the state plays in the case. The rule would seem to be that in proportion as the world's industries grow must the state advance in its efforts to assist the industrious to advantageous relations with each other. The tendency to regulate labor rigorously and minutely is as strong in England, where the state is considered the agent of the citizen, as it was in Athens, where the citizen was deemed the child and tool of the state, and where the workman was a slave." *

On this subject the First Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor contains important hints. These official statements deserve the more attention because their aim is scientific and thoroughly unpartisan. Especially significant is the following outline of what the state can do with regard to financial depressions. It is one of the many evidences that the let-alone theory has been overcome in the United States. Beginning on page 292, the Report says: "There is no universal panacea, no absolute remedy for depressions; but if the public, through sentiment or through its agents in the legislatures of the country, can stimulate any methods for the mitigation of the severity and the shortening of the duration of the industrial depressions, certainly the effort should be made. And first, what can be done by legislation? With a healthy public

* "The State," 653.

opinion behind it, the law-making power can prevent to a great degree the unholy speculation in food products. It can indulge in a conservative care in extending railroad building and in facilitating the organization of manufacturing corporations. It can restrict the grants of the public domain. It can enact uniform bankruptcy laws, extending the provisions of such laws so that the poor man indebted but a few hundred dollars shall be able to re-adjust his financial affairs as readily as the larger debtor. It can abridge the provisions of laws relating to the collection of debts, to the end that the credit system shall not be abused. It can regulate transportation on a just and uniform basis, to the end that the stockholder shall not be robbed by ruinous competition, and that the workman may calculate with some degree of certainty the cost of his living and the producer the cost of production, so far as transportation is concerned. It can see to it that the tariff shall be regulated on the basis of justice and science and not on a haphazard basis which affects only individual interests and oftentimes inflicts general harm. It can see that a stable currency be guaranteed, that the workman may know the purchasing power of his stipulated earnings. It can consider what reasonable and humane regulations may be adopted relative to immigration, and see to it that labor is not lowered either in standard or through earnings by the pernicious method of importations by contract; that every lawful endeavor be made to stimulate industrial education in all parts of the country; that the necessity shall be recognized of the industrial development of all parts of the land that there may result a legitimate increase in the consuming power of the people. It can stimulate the growth of the principle of industrial co-partnerships through methods of profit-sharing by wise, permissive laws. Public sentiment can encourage the perfect organization of the

forces involved, to the end that each shall treat with the other through representatives, and that production shall be regulated by the demand and not by ill-advised eagerness of men to push their work individually, to the detriment of others; that there may come the universal adoption of shorter hours of labor, and demand that after capital and labor shall have received fixed and reasonable compensation, each for its investment, the net profits of production shall be divided under profit-sharing plans or methods, or through industrial co-partnerships, to the end that all the forces of production shall be equally alive to mutual welfare. It can ask that the contracts of labor be as free as the contracts for commodities, under fair agreements for services rendered, to the end that the workman shall not be obliged to make contracts on terms not acceptable to him, and it can hold the party which declines to resort to the conciliatory methods of arbitration morally responsible for all the ill effects growing out of contest."

All this the commissioner regards possible; it simply demands "a fair recognition of a part only of the truth bound up in the rule which insists that all men shall do unto others as they would have others do unto them."

Literature.

Numerous works have recently appeared on the history of property in land and on what is called the nationalization of the land. Laveleye, "Primitive Property," Macmillan. Henry Sumner Maine, "Village Communities," Murray, London. Paul Lafargue, "The Evolution of Property," Sonnenschein. Fustel de Coulanges, "Origin of Property in Land," the same. Hearn, "The Aryan Household," Langmanns, Green & Co. Letourneau, "Property: Its Origin and Development," Walter Scott, London. Samter, "*Das Eigenthum in seiner Socialen Bedentung*," Fischer, Jena. The writings of Henry George, especially his "Progress

and Poverty," have been the occasion of an extensive literature in America, England and on the Continent. His theory is usually discussed in political economy. A. R. Wallace, "Land Nationalization," Sonnenschein. Harold Cox, same title, Methuen, London. Dawson, "The Unearned Increment," Sonnenschein. A keen criticism of Henry George's theory that progress increases poverty and that "all the advantages gained by the march of progress go to the owners of land and wages do not increase," is given in F. A. Walker's "Political Economy," Third Edit., 417–433. In many cases the advantages to labor and to the industries are much greater than to rent. In "*Zeitschrift fuer Staatswissenschaft*," 1887, Professor A. Wagner has two articles in which he gives strong reasons for the limitation of individual wealth. He argues that it would be just and a public blessing, and that wealth itself would not be decreased by better distribution. In the same journal, 1896, p. 658, von Schubert-Soldern says that it is "to the interest of the public not to let the concentration of wealth be too great."

DATE DUE

JUN 15 1971

JUN 15 1994

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

HN64 .S93
The social problem
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00002 2402